The Outlook

MARCH 8, 1913

LYMAN ABBOTT, Editor-in-Chief HAMILTON W. MABIE, Associate Editor
THEODORE ROOSEVELT
Contributing Editor

Mexico: The Rule of Huerta

Mexico City was quiet last week, but whether it was the quiet of terror or of stolid acquiescence is hard to say. The deposition and death of President Madero, and the formal recognition by the Congress of Huerta as Provisional President, were followed by energetic action of the new Government in establishing its control over the military and civil organization. This control is now complete in the capital, but in some of the States Madero's followers threaten serious resistance. This is notably so in Sonora and Coahuila; in the latter, Governor Carranza has issued a statement denying that he is dealing with the Huerta Government, and declaring that he would never compromise with it; there have been outbreaks in Coahuila among the regular military forces, and armed Maderists are gathering in the hill country. On Friday of last week it was reported that Aguas Calientes was in the hands of rebels and that rail communication between the United States and Mexico City was cut off. On the other hand, Huerta seems to have come to an agreement with Vasquez Gomez, whose followers, the Vasquistas, represent the strongest force of former malcontents in the north, while it is reported also that negotiations are secretly proceeding between Huerta and Zapata, head of the semi-brigand army of Zapatistas south of the capital and dangerously near it. These negotiations, however, did not prevent Huerta from grimly approving the slaughter of a band of seventeen of Zapata's men caught in the act of pillage. There is a strong impression among those well acquainted with Mexican affairs that the Huerta dictatorship—for it is little less—will encounter strong opposition as soon as his enemies find a leader about whom they may center, and that to hold his own he must show greater power as an organizer and ruler of men than did either Madero or Porfirio Diaz in the latter part of his career.

Shall Huerta be Recognized?

Following the outcry of protest and wrath at the murder of the two Maderos, Francisco and Gustavo (renewed for a day or two by the unconfirmed news of the killing of a third brother, Emilio), the foreign residents of Mexico City seem to have reached the conclusion that there is nothing to do but to accept the situation as accomplished fact. The diplomats doubt the possibility of disproving the denials of Huerta and Felix Diaz of complicity in the killing of President Madero and Vice-President Suarez, and it has been pointed out that the actual perpetrators of the deed may very possibly have acted, not on direct instructions, but because they knew that the death of the two men would at heart be approved by the conspirators who had betrayed and deposed them. The story of the occurrence as first officially told did not account for some of the ascertained facts; as revised, the official account is that two separate rescue attacks were made on the automobiles conveying Madero and Suarez to the penitentiary. This account says, as summarized in the press reports:

> When the two automobiles conveying the prisoners and the guard had reached the intersection of the Calle Lecumberri and the Avenida de la Bolsa, five armed men sprang in front of the motor cars and demanded the surrender of Madero and Suarez. Major Cardenas ordered the rurales to fire. Volleys were exchanged and some of the attacking party were wounded, although the prisoners were not hit. The automobiles were speeded through the attackers and were driven to the rear of the penitentiary.
>
> There another force of rescuers opened fire on the automobiles, and Madero and Suarez sprang to the ground and attempted to escape. At least thirty men were shooting toward the guards and prisoners, and it is impossible to determine whether Madero and Suarez were

DRURY COLLEGE LIBRARY
Springfield, Missouri

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

slain by their friends or by the return fire of Cardenas's men.

The Huerta Government claims to have found proof of financial defaulting by Madero's orders, and will probably confiscate the large estates of the Madero family. It announces that it will correct the abuses that characterized the Madero régime; that grafting will be eliminated; that necessary public works will be undertaken and completed; that foreign enterprise and capital will be welcomed and protected, and that foreign investors may be assured of protection and fair treatment. Mr. Wilson, our Ambassador to Mexico, last week not only expressed his belief that the Provisional Government in Mexico was innocent of the charge that it had instigated the killing of Madero and Suarez, but recommended our State Department to recognize the Huerta Government, evidently as the most direct way in which to bring about immediate security and stability. Press reports indicate reluctance at Washington to act with haste, and, in view of the tardiness of the United States as to recognizing the Republic of China, surely haste in the present Mexican situation might appear unseemly. Apparently the question is one with which the Wilson Administration must deal. Meanwhile, the Second Division of the United States Army has been massed near Galveston under the command of General William H. Carter, who had command of the former great mobilization of our forces in Texas. The precision and promptness of this military movement (which is not in the least to be construed as a threat or forerunner of rash action) were due to recent reforms in our military organization which will later be discussed in some detail in The Outlook.

The Near East: Rumania

The Near Eastern question is one of boundaries. On the mainland it was not affected by the comparatively unimportant events of the Balkan war last week, but it was affected by diplomatic events. Chief among these were the agreement between Rumania and Bulgaria to submit their difference to mediation. Why should they have a difference? Suppose that, at the close of the Tripolitan war, Great Britain had said to Italy, "You have greatly enlarged your African territory. I have done nothing to hinder it. If I had done something, I could have hindered it. Take all you have gained, however, and give me a thin little slice next to my property in Africa, so that there shall not be too great an expansion there of any one Power." This sort of thing was "put up" to Bulgaria by Rumania. Rumania had not interfered with Bulgaria's war against Turkey because, however the Rumanian Government may have felt, the Rumanian people, in general, are pro-Balkan in sympathy and not pro-Turk. The Rumanian Government's excuse in asking Bulgaria to cede a little strip of territory was, therefore, no excuse at all. The real excuse is that Rumania still smarts at a wrong done to her. She had been a vital factor in helping Russia to win in the Russo-Turkish war of 1877. But the Congress of Berlin, redefining frontiers in the Near East as a result of that war, took much of the northern province of Bessarabia from Rumania for Russia, ostensibly making good to Rumania by adding to her territory a part of the Bulgarian Dobrudja, a low-lying and comparatively little-valuable land to the south. Bulgaria is now asked slightly to increase this territory, so that, among other possible advantages, Rumania may have a longer seacoast. Bulgaria does not object to a little longer seacoast for Rumania when the Bulgarian coast is about to be doubled, but she decidedly objects to ceding the important town of Silistria, with its population, mostly Bulgarian, at the western tip of the territory in question. Hence the hitch.

The Near East: Albania

Diplomacy was also busy during the week in another quarter—Albania. So much delighted were the Albanians at the decision of the London Conference to erect Albania into an autonomous state that they began claiming for their eastern frontier a line which would have included a number of settlements more largely Greek or Servian than Albanian. This was not altogether unnatural, as the Turkish Government had never maintained an exactly definite eastern Albanian boundary. The Powers have now indicated that the future Albania will be restricted to a territory which comprises the present district inhabited almost exclusively by Albanians. The northernmost part of Albania is now occupied by Montenegrin troops, and when peace is made would not improbably be added to Montenegro despite Austria's absurd protests—if such protests have really been made. The southernmost part is now occupied by Greek troops, and,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when peace is made, may be added to Greece. The Albanians represent three religions: the Mohammedan, the Greek, and the Roman Catholic, the Mohammedan being in the majority. Although they were once nobly led by a great captain, Skanderbeg, they have never developed any other leader who commanded the confidence of the whole country. Even Skanderbeg, who died in 1467, and who defeated every army sent against him, though led by such conquering Sultans as Murad II and Mohammed II, was not always able to hold together a people torn by internal feud. Probably nowhere in the world is there a region more given up to inter-tribal conflict. On the other hand, the inspiring spectacle of what has already been accomplished in developing peasant people into a nation productive of able statesmen in Bulgaria leads one to suppose that something may also be done with the brave warriors of Albania, impatient of control as they have always been, and defying racial obliteration from the days when they were known as Illyrians to the present time.

The Near East: Thrace

But, if we may believe the despatches from St. Petersburg, there is a still more important quarter in which diplomacy has been busy. From these despatches it would appear, first, that Turkey has once more signified her readiness to negotiate for peace with Bulgaria, this time on the basis of ceding all of the province of Thrace, including the fortress and city of Adrianople, but excluding the region along the southern boundary. To this end, on learning that Russia would decline to support the Bulgarian demand for a war indemnity from Turkey (the allies demand $200,000,000, so it is reported), the Ottoman Government has solicited the good offices of the Russian Government, which, it is announced, has now transmitted to the Bulgarian Government the Turkish proposals for fresh negotiations. It is to be hoped that these reports will be confirmed, and that the world may now really see the beginning of the end of the Balkan war. Perhaps these diplomatic exchanges may explain the strange failure on the part of the Bulgarian army to follow up its recent victories on the Gallipoli Peninsula at the entrance of the Dardanelles Straits. The European Powers, it is known, have heretofore resolved that Turkey shall continue to be intrusted with the guardianship of the Straits, under international sanction and control. According to the London "Times," the Bulgarians have lost seventy thousand men in Thrace alone. But their army there is now apparently larger than ever, comprising, according to the "Times," no less than five hundred and fifty thousand men in the field. The old Bulgarian Emperors of the tenth and thirteenth centuries, Simeon and John Asên II, would be proud to see the Bulgaria of to-day.

"The Money Trust"

One of the most interesting documents growing out of the investigation of the so-called "Money Trust" by the Pujo Congressional Committee is the letter sent last week to Chairman Pujo by Messrs. J. P. Morgan & Co. In style, in spirit, and in reasoning it is a remarkably able document, and it ought to be widely and carefully read. The letter is a long one, but the fundamental doctrine which it supports by careful argument is contained in the following passage:

> We suggest to you that such ills—and they are neither few nor trifling—as are existent in this country's financial affairs are the outcome of a clumsy and outworn banking system rather than of the schemes of men; and that to eradicate such ills at their source there is needed, not legislation upon some one or more isolated symptoms, but rather a careful diagnosis of our whole banking system; a study of the successful systems of other countries which for decades have been free from the periodic panics which have distressed this country; and, finally, co-operation among all committees in Congress which consider this subject, to the one end of wise and comprehensive—as contrasted with piecemeal—legislation.

It is difficult to report in a paragraph, with any justice to the writers, an argument which fills several columns of a daily newspaper, but we endeavor to condense this argument in brief as follows: The concentration of capital in New York City is largely due to the economic law of supply and demand, for credit and money are commodities which follow the trade movements of other commodities. Bankers as a body are obedient to these economic laws, and panics are not due to their cunningly devised schemes, but to bad legislation which violates economic law. The evils of concentration of money are, however, greatly exaggerated. The whole tendency is towards diffusion of banks and banking throughout the country, instead of concentration in New York City. This is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proved by statistics. The consolidation of New York City banks has grown, not out of a desire to dominate credits and industry, but to promote efficiency. Example: To obey the Government decision in the recent Union Pacific Railway case will require financial operations amounting to $126,000,000. Such transactions cannot be handled by an individual bank, no matter how large, but require co-operation on the part of many banks. The danger of "interlocking directorates" has been exaggerated. The banking houses handling railway and industrial securities are really trustees for the public; they must have representatives on the boards of these corporations, not for selfish reasons, but for really altruistic reasons—that is to say, to protect their customers, the public. It is true that there are individuals who are greedy and selfish. The most efficient corrective of the financial evils that grow out of greed and selfishness is public opinion. But public opinion must be expressed in, and fortified by, a scientific banking system firmly established by law.

What the Morgan Letter Means

With the general spirit and recommendations of Messrs. Morgan & Co.'s letter outlined above we are in hearty sympathy. Its purpose, we surmise, is not to resist Congressional action or Federal supervision, but to guard against either unjust or unwise Congressional action. The danger of unwise action is, we think, a very real one. Owing to the selfish and corrupt practices of a certain school of financiers, now happily decreasing, the public has come to have a feeling that every man with an office in Wall Street is to be regarded with suspicion. If anybody is to blame for this state of mind, we think that the banking class must bear the greater part of the blame, but it is clearly the duty of Congress not to play upon the unreasoning fears of the public, but to allay those fears. We must frankly say that the employment by the Pujo Committee of Mr. Untermyer as their chief counsel and advocate, brilliant as he is, has had to some extent the effect of inflaming the public imagination, rather than of guiding the public from the domain of imagination into the domain of facts. As to the views of Mr. Morgan and the group of men who are associated with him as partners—no finer body of men exists in any one financial institution in the United States—we can only repeat what we said in commenting upon Mr. Morgan's personal testimony when it was given before the Pujo Committee last December. He and his associates, we believe, have the highest appreciation of their personal responsibilities as trustees for the public. But the theory of unrestricted personal power in the financial world is the theory of despotism; it may sometimes be benevolent and sometimes malevolent, but it is always despotism. To supply the needed regulation The Outlook was in favor, and still is in favor, of the general principles of the bill proposed by the Monetary Commission, a bill which failed to obtain the confidence of the country, partly because the name of Senator Aldrich was so intimately connected with it, and partly because the bankers were loth to give the Government complete control in the administration of the system devised by the bill. If the *majority* of the Central Board of Directors of the so-called National Reserve Association had been made appointive by the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate, we think much of the popular distrust of the plan would have been removed. The letter of Messrs. Morgan & Co. to the Pujo Committee is admirable in so far as it means that the bank currency and credits of the country must by law be made mobile, elastic, and widely diffused in their nature. We raise the question, however, whether it means what the bankers of the country have yet to come to a realization of, the fact that no currency law can be passed in which the direct, effective, and unquestioned power of the Government to supervise is not fully recognized.

Congress and the People's Money

Even if the enormous sums voted hastily and in a log-rolling fashion by Congress in the last days of the session just ended were worth while in themselves, and even if it is wise and sensible to spend so much money at one time, the fact remains that no one knows, or seems to care, whether the division of the whole has been intelligently made, whether or not too much has been spent in some directions, too little in others. A sensible housekeeper or business man makes at least a rough estimate in advance of the amounts to be spent in different directions; the relative needs and relative possibilities are canvassed; in short, a budget is prepared. When the House of Rep-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resentatives last week cut down the Naval Appropriation Bill and refused to provide for building two battle-ships, while making enormous appropriations for public buildings and river and harbor appropriations in the old "pork barrel" fashion, did it act from genuine motives of economy in the one case and of pressing public need on the other, or were the two actions due to the same cause—politics? Certainly the time was exactly ripe for President Taft's special Message on the budget plan. He pointed out that alone among the great nations the United States is doing business without a budget; that experience and common sense show that it is foolish to spend a thousand millions a year without a programme; that a National budget would not only give a financial perspective and help Congress to work with defined purpose, but that it would locate responsibility for keeping revenues and estimates in line, would furnish ready reference to reports and records, and would tell the country what the Government is doing and planning. To carry out the budget plan and provide a sinking fund to reduce the now growing deficit, Mr. Taft recommended a commission to consist of the Chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the Attorney-General, and the Secretary of the Treasury, with the Comptroller of the Treasury as annual auditor of the sinking fund account. If, he said, Congress should set aside $45,000,000 a year for the sinking fund, the present National debt might be wiped out in about twenty-one years. Other suggestions of economy and efficiency in the public expenditure are made, most notable among them being a plan of classifying what are now Presidential appointments, with a reduction of $6,500,000 in the annual salary roll. Whatever the details of financial and administrative reform may be, the sentiment of the country calls loudly for legislation which would prevent the present haphazard, hasty, and ill-considered handling of appropriation bills in the closing hours of every session of Congress.

Workmen's Compensation for the Canal Zone

President Taft, under the authority conferred on him by the Panama Canal Act, promulgated last week a Workmen's Compensation Law for the Canal Zone. The law eliminates the old common law defenses of contributory negligence, assumption of risk, and the responsibility of fellow-servants. Compensation is provided for every injury received by a Canal employee while at work, and for death resulting from such an injury, except in cases where the injury was caused by the employee's deliberate intention or from his intoxication. If an employee is injured, he receives no compensation for the first five days of disability. If he is totally disabled, he receives a monthly compensation equal to one-half of his monthly pay for a period not exceeding six years. After the six-year period, during the continuance of the disability, he receives a monthly compensation of from twenty-five to forty per cent of his monthly pay. If he is only partially disabled, so that it is possible for him to continue or return to work at a lower wage, he receives a monthly compensation of one-half the difference between his old monthly pay and his new rate of wages. There is a similar reduction in the rate of compensation after six years, if the disability continue so long. In case of the death of an employee as a result of an injury received while at work, those dependent upon him receive various rates of compensation, depending upon the closeness of the relationship. A widow, for instance, without children, will receive thirty-five per cent of her husband's wages for six years, and from twenty to thirty per cent thereafter, provided she was wholly dependent upon her husband for support. If there are children, there will also be paid ten per cent of the employee's wages for each child; the compensation, however, paid to the widow and children together must not exceed one-half of the wages. Proportionate rates are established for orphaned children and other relatives who may have been wholly or partially dependent. In the case of the more remote relationships, however, compensation is not paid if there are living others more closely related. The Federal Government is doing in this instance only what every large industry ought to be required to do—bear the cost of injuries which industry inevitably inflicts upon those who engage in it.

The Hague Court Works in War Time

In the opinion of most people, the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague is a phrase synonymous with "peace." It ought to be first of all synonymous with "justice." As emphasizing both, the Hague Court's most recent decision is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interesting. It comes at a time when Europe is resounding with war rather than peace, for no sooner does Turkey end her war with Italy over Tripoli than she begins one with the Balkan allies over a far more vital question. During the first war the Italian Government seized two French steamers plying between Marseilles and Tunis because these steamers had on board an aeroplane and a contingent of the Turkish Red Crescent which the Italians thought not composed of bona-fide members. The French Government complained of this violation of the laws of war regarding neutrals as laid down by the recent "Declaration of London," to which both France and Italy were signatories. Italy thereupon released the ships, but declared that the question should be submitted to the Hague Court. France agreed, and the decision has just been announced. The case is the twelfth to come up before the Court, which has now been in existence for a decade. The case is interesting, first of all, not so much because it marked the first instance of submission to the Court of any trouble growing out of a current war, as because the two Governments instantly agreed upon arbitration. Thus the seizures ceased to be matters of public comment before the steamers in question had completed their trips to Tunis and back. The case is interesting, secondly, because its hearing was not prolonged and because the decision swiftly follows the termination of the war. The case is interesting, thirdly, because of its likeness to the Trent affair in 1861, when Mason and Slidell, intrusted by the Confederacy with a mission to England to secure British aid for the Southern cause, were taken in the Bahama Channel from the British ship Trent, engaged in the West Indian packet service, by the American Captain Wilkes, to the American war steamer San Jacinto. The American and British press were long full of the Trent affair, but the comparatively small amount of newspaper comment on the present case illustrates how the world has advanced in settling its international difficulties.

Aeroplanes Contraband of War

Finally, this latest case before the Hague Court is interesting because it is the first arbitral case in which an aeroplane is concerned. It had not yet been defined whether under all conditions an aeroplane is contraband of war. The recent "Declaration of London," subscribed to by the principal maritime nations, defines aircraft as conditional contraband—that is to say, as contraband if it is obvious that the air-craft are to be used for warlike purposes—and apparently those seized by Italy were not. The special agreement for arbitration stated the questions at issue and named the arbitrators. Five men were chosen as the proper number of arbitrators. First of all, the most distinguished authorities in international law in each country were chosen. France selected Professor Louis Renault, who has been a member of five out of the twelve Courts of Arbitration held under the Hague Treaty, and who was also a member of the two International Peace Congresses at The Hague; Italy chose Professor Guido Fusinato, a member of the Council of State, a deputy in the Lower House of Parliament, a former Minister of Public Instruction, a member of the Second Hague Peace Conference, and, what is especially significant, one of the men who negotiated the peace which terminated the Italo-Turkish War. The other men chosen were "disinterested persons"—Professor de Taube, Russian Counselor of State and Assistant Minister of Public Instruction; Dr. Kriege, legal adviser of the German Minister of Foreign Affairs, and a member of the Second Hague Peace Conference; and Hjalmar Hammarskjold, Governor of the province of Upsala in Sweden, who had previously helped to decide two other Hague cases, and who was president of the tribunal vested with the duty of settling the Franco-German difficulty with regard to Casablanca in Morocco. He was also made president of this latest Hague tribunal. The five arbitrators came quickly together, and their decision, as announced by the New York "Sun," provides that Italy must pay four hundred thousand dollars in damages.

Damrosch's "Cyrano"

For a while on Thursday of last week at the Metropolitan Opera-House, New York, the listener might well have been prepared for a surprise. Here, it seemed, there was an opera that, superficially at least, showed scarcely any trace of Wagner—and this an opera written in America within the past ten years. Walter Damrosch's new opera, "Cyrano," begins as an opera of the French type, light, melodious, with a dash of Italian flavor, especially as the principals on the stage come up before the footlights and show what they can do with a high note; but it ends as a genuine tragic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

musik-drama of the German type—still with a dash of Italian in it, while the principals act on the stage with all the histrionic ability they can show, and the orchestra does its best to express the progress and mutations of the state of their emotions. This progressive development—some people might call it retrogressive—may be partly explained by the fact that a dozen years or so elapsed between the beginning of its composition and the end; but it partly may be reasonably accounted for by the nature of the story. As everybody knows, the scene is laid in France at the period of the "précieuses," when the height of life was attained in forms of exquisite expression, be it in manner or in phrase. Cyrano—we shall remind our readers—soldier, fencer, poet, and wit, was by nature designed for his time, except for his ugliness. His nose was a sad impediment. Thus barred from the favor of his loved Roxane, he put his soul, his wit, his poetry, at the service of his rival, Christian, and won for him the lady's land. At last, as Christian died, Roxane learned that in loving him she really loved the soul of Cyrano. Cyrano himself, however, preserved his own sense of honor by denying to Roxane the love she had discovered, and, after being wounded in battle, died on his feet, thrusting his sword at his enemies, Hypocrisy, Prejudice, and Compromise.

"Cyrano" as an Opera

Rostand's play has been somewhat changed in its adaptation to opera by Mr. W. J Henderson, but it was a play destined for opera. Mr. Damrosch was wise in hitting upon such a libretto. No matter how good the music of an opera may be, if the libretto does not lend itself to theatrical representation the work is doomed. The opera "Cyrano" is essentially operatic. That is a great deal in its favor. In this respect it has a much better chance than Mr. Damrosch's former work "The Scarlet Letter"—indeed, a better chance than the other two recent attempts at opera in English, Parker's "Mona" and Converse's "Pipe of Desire." All the early part of "Cyrano," moreover, is full of appeals to those who like obvious tunes with obvious endings—music that does not stir greatly or make one think, but that can be easily understood and that pleases a wide variety of tastes. It often seemed that the composer was saying to his audience, "Now is the time to applaud," and the audience was always glad to comply. In the earlier part of the opera there was a good deal of music that might be reproduced on the phonograph for the delectation of a mixed audience. In the latter part the music was less popular, but the audience by that time were interested in the play and the acting. That does not mean that the music itself was not really better. As an example of opera in English, it confirmed the impression that other instances have given—that the language does not make very much difference. Occasionally one could hear a word, or a few words, and recognize them, especially if one had read the libretto. There was no indication that the English language interferes with the production of good tone. At the end of the performance Mr. Damrosch was called to the footlights and made a graceful speech of appreciation, acknowledging his obligation to Mr. Rostand, to Mr. Henderson, and to Mr. Gatti-Casazza, who is in command of the Metropolitan Opera-House forces, and whose breadth of mind has done much for the progress of opera in New York and, indeed, throughout the country. Opera is distinctly an art that depends upon the favor of a class. It must be fostered by those who have an abundance of wealth or it cannot exist. The fortunes of an opera, therefore, are not necessarily due to its merits as a work of art, but partly to its merits as a means for supplying a social occasion. There is much in "Cyrano" that gives reason for the promise that it may remain in the operatic repertory.

A Lighthouse for the Blind

On Washington's Birthday, in the presence of the President of the United States and many other distinguished visitors, there was opened in New York City a new lighthouse, one of those which, it is hoped, will keep the blind from shipwreck all over the country, when a series of such beacons are lighted from point to point. The significance of this form of helpfulness is seen in the motto of the New York Association, "Light Through Work." The essential idea is to help blind men, women, and children to make their lives serviceable, to afford them opportunities for work which will not be merely charity disguised as work, and to educate the public to prevent blindness and decrease its extent in the future. All the speakers at the exercises on Washington's Birthday referred with earnest appreciation to the splendid results obtained already by the Association, chiefly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through the energy, persistence, and intelligence of Miss Winifred Holt. Among the speakers was Miss Helen Keller, the foremost living exemplar of what may be done in bringing a child blind, deaf, and dumb from infancy into close communication with the living world of people and events. President Finley of the City College, Joseph H. Choate, and others joined in recognizing the value of the work already done. Practical illustrations of the results already obtained were seen in the presentation by a group of blind children of a miracle play called "The Blind Unchained," written by Miss Winifred Holt and Miss Carolyn Wells, and a military drill by blind Boy Scouts from the public school. The Lighthouse is to be a meeting-place for the blind, and also to some extent an industrial college as well as a library and a museum. The opportunities for extension of this work are almost unlimited. The inaugural exercises on Washington's Birthday were so interesting and picturesque that it may surely be hoped that New York citizens will join generously in making it possible to carry the work on, and widely. The report of the Association will surprise many who have thought of the blind only as subjects of charity, because it shows in many forms, and both through description and picture, how varied are the things which the blind can do when properly trained. Here, for instance, are pictures of blind girls threading their own looms for spinning, of a blind pupil typewriting directly from the phonograph, a blind stenographer who took dictation from President Taft, a blind man who tunes pianos as a business, blind women playing chess, blind boys playing baseball, and finally a blind boy operating a wireless apparatus. No wonder that Mr. Choate says:

> For myself, I have absolute faith in the women who have set this work in motion, and especially in the leader of these women, to whose enthusiasm and devotion so much is due; full faith in the guides and principles on which they are proceeding: full faith in the blind people that they will make the most of the opportunities that will be here presented to them, and faith in the people that they will rally to the support of this great cause.

Religious Conditions in Mexico

Protestant missionary endeavors in Mexico are carried on by the American Bible Society, and by the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Episcopal Mission Boards. From the latest report of the Episcopal Board we learn that in Mexico marriage among a large proportion of the poorer classes is looked upon as a useless formality, an expensive luxury which they can ill afford; that this is largely due to the exorbitant fees which the Roman Catholic Church demands under penalty of excommunication; baptism is also very widely neglected, because the people are too poor to pay the fee; and that a native independent church, La Iglesia Católica Mexicana, has arisen, of which Dr. Aves is, by its own free choice, bishop, as well as being bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the missionary district of Mexico. Even before the overthrow of the Madero Government, Bishop Aves wrote that the outlook for peace was not encouraging, for peace implies a firmly established government; and a popular government, such as that to which the United States of Mexico is committed by its constitution, can never become stable so long as it rests on a social basis of popular ignorance and poverty. He thinks "it would seem inevitable that the discontent that is awakened by the slow evolutionary processes of education should express itself impatiently by resort to arms." With this in view, and with the knowledge that these people have yet to learn the first principle of popular government—the sovereignty of the majority—it is important, in the Bishop's opinion and in ours, that the missionary efforts emanating from this country be exerted in the interests of a Christian patriotism looking to the franchise of an intelligent citizenship both as the surest safeguard to personal freedom and as the most potential means to a nation's development. Dr. Aves adds in his discussion of this important matter:

> The importance of such positive, conservative Christian teaching is stressed by the fact that the education we give these people offers to them the opportunity of learning much from the propagators of Socialism, communism, and the like, whose teachings are being widely disseminated in Mexico, and are peculiarly pernicious and dangerous when addressed to the partially enlightened minds of men living under conditions that are enthralling and oppressive; so that it is hardly a matter of surprise that our American missions should be under indictment by our Roman brethren as the generators of discontent and sedition, as well as of apostasy.

If we would follow the divine method, concludes the Bishop, we must do more than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lead these people from their dark bondage of ignorance into the open wilderness of free thinking; we must lead them even to the mount of obedience.

Talking "Movies" Just as moving-picture actors had succeeded in resuscitating the art of pantomime, comes word that the ban of silence has been lifted from their flickering lips. This edict of freedom has been long foreshadowed by various tentative efforts to link the phonograph and the kinetoscope. It remained, however, for the Frankenstein of both these machines to break his creatures to double harness. Though Mr. Edison's new kinetophone involves no principles unfamiliar to the general public, the combination of old ideas seems as startling as it is successful. Briefly stated, he has devised a recording phonograph as delicate as the human ear. In the past, phonographs, however sturdy their voices, have been decidedly deaf. They have declined to take in anything that was not spoken or played for their especial benefit, directly into their capacious trumpets. With such instruments, those who have previously striven to make the "movies" speak have been forced to take their pictures first and then to create an independent voice-record to fit that film. The difficulty of such a method can be readily imagined. With this new phonograph all such makeshift systems are abolished. The machine is placed anywhere within ear-shot and out of range of the camera's lens, and picture-taking and record-making proceed simultaneously. Of course such a process involves the invention of governing mechanism whereby the speed of film and disk can be simultaneously controlled. This also Mr. Edison has accomplished. The first public exhibition of the kinetophone was given Monday, the 17th of February, in four New York vaudeville theaters. Two "films" (there is yet no inclusive term for films and phonograph records) were shown and heard. In the first a man discusses with many oratorical flourishes of voice and limb the history and future of the invention, and then illustrates the possibilities of the kinetophone by breaking plates, blowing horns and whistles. and by the introduction of a singer, a pianist, a violinist, and a barking dog. The second "film" presented to the audience was a minstrel troupe in full cry. The value of the kinetophone is too obvious to be emphasized or discussed. What would we not give for such a record of the Gettysburg Address!

A Law Against Aerial Spying The Aerial Navigation Bill, a measure of international importance, has just passed both houses of the British Parliament, has received the royal assent, and becomes operative immediately. By its provisions any foreign air-craft flying over specified areas of the coast line of Great Britain, especially the ports where there are naval stations and the territorial waters surrounding them, under certain conditions and after a certain warning has been given, are exposed to the risk of being fired upon by specially authorized military agents in the specified territory. The Secretary of War, Colonel J. E. B. Seeley, piloted the bill through the House of Commons. It called forth little debate. To statements in the Conservative press, Colonel Seeley, when the bill was being read a second time, made reply as follows: "I would point out to the House that the bill is not aimed at the air-craft of any foreign power, but rather at preventing mischievous persons, possibly from oversea, from hovering over places where there are combustible stores, to the great inconvenience of the people of this country." The action of the Government in pushing through the bill is presumed to have been quickened by the fact that during a comparatively short period air-craft have been seen hovering over Liverpool, Dover, Portsmouth, and Cardiff; and those visits raised the unpleasant suspicion in the minds of Britishers that the visits may have been more often than they were aware of. The London "Times" aptly remarks, in a concluding paragraph of an article on the question of these visits: "This aerial espionage, of unknown extent and minuteness, is an intrusion which we have a right to resent. Its motives are not likely to be friendly, nor can we flatter ourselves that the beauty of the bird's-eye view of our ports is so great as to lead foreigners to spend so much money in order to derive æsthetic gratification from it." In order to carry out the new law, sky guns, constructed for the purpose of firing at air-craft, are being fixed at various ports in the specified areas over which air-craft are forbidden to fly. It is expected that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these provisions will be sufficient, by their mere institution and without demonstration, to stop the uninvited visits of the foreign air-craft. The reports published in the British press relative to nocturnal visits of the marauding air-craft have been subjected to derision on the part of the German newspapers, and certain insinuations that the air-craft are of German ownership have been strongly resented. It is perfectly ridiculous, the German press states, to make such accusations, because air-craft capable of such journeys at night remain yet to be constructed; and if they were now in existence, they could not possibly remain long undiscovered by the numerous non-German investigators in Berlin and other German cities.

The Reichstag Censures the Ministry

Two interesting events have occurred in the German Parliament. The first took place in the Reichstag, the lower house. It was the vote of a want of confidence in the Ministry. Such a vote is without precedent in German history. It shows the aggressive independence to be expected from the present Reichstag with its strong Socialist representation. On the other hand, the vote is interesting because it disapproves the Government's policy with regard to the law excluding Jesuits—hardly to have been expected from the Socialists. But, be it noted, the victorious opposition was made up of the Clericals and the Social Democrats. As there is no probability that the Government will repeal that law, it may be that this opposition will oppose all Government measures, and thereby force the Imperial Chancellor either to dissolve Parliament or to resign. The second event took place in the Bundesrath, the upper house; namely, its rejection of an admirable resolution adopted a year and a half ago by the Reichstag, and reflecting, we believe, the opinions of the majority of Germans, asking that dueling in the army be effectually prohibited, and, to this end, demanding the expulsion of all duelists from the army. The Bundesrath, in rejecting the resolution, actually gave moral support to dueling when carried on "upon ideal grounds;" and, while expressing a desire that dueling might be less frequent, claimed that no action need be taken, since it is already on the decrease! Finally, in the Bundesrath's opinion, no end can be put to dueling until measures are taken to apply not only to the army, but to all classes. Hence it refused even to consider the dismissal of army officers who participate in a duel. The old custom, it seems, cannot be quickly eradicated. The feeling exists in other countries than in Germany that one would rather turn a man out of the army who refuses to fight than one who wants to fight. The world, however, is reaching the conclusion that there is a better way to secure justice and maintain honor among individuals than by personal encounter—even among fighting men. Such, we believe, are the German Emperor's sentiments.

Dueling

In this connection it is interesting to note the views of other rulers than the German Emperor concerning dueling. The Austrian Emperor also discourages dueling. He has ordered that officers should, whenever possible, seek redress for insult, not by dueling, but from the law courts. Until the issue of this order, every officer who received an insult had either to challenge his assailant or cut him down on the spot. Did the officer fail to do either one of these two things, he was not only obliged to leave the regiment, but actually to forfeit his commission. But the venerable Francis Joseph does not stop with this. In particular, he declares that no officer shall be required to fight, and warns all commanders to see that no duels are fought among officers for trifling causes, or, indeed, for any cause, until a court of honor has declared that no other course is open. The Russian Emperor opposes dueling except for the most serious offenses. A reflex of this view is seen both in military and civil life. In the army, the influential commander, General Kuropatkin, has urged the Emperor to abolish dueling entirely among officers. In civil life, the duels among Russian university students are in striking contrast to those among students over the border in Germany. The German system of fighting for no cause at all, but just because a man happens to be promoted from one number to another in a dueling corps, has resulted in an immense number of so-called duels. So far from being an exhibition of expert swordsmanship, these often result in a sword cut on the cheek which the defeated antagonist afterwards exhibits as an evidence of prowess! In Russia, on the other hand, student duels are comparatively rare; they are the outcome of serious differences only, and have not infrequently been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fought to the death. But the Italian King seems most in earnest about the suppression of dueling, if we may judge from the report that he directed the man who provoked a recent duel to be dismissed from the army and sentenced the other of the principals to a year's confinement in a fortress. Victor Emanuel III then condemned each of the four officers who acted as seconds to three months' confinement. For having permitted the duel to take place the colonel of the regiment was deprived of his command, and the lieutenant-colonel sentenced to a month's arrest. The Anti-Dueling League probably regards this action as a particularly important contribution to its cause.

THE NEW PRESIDENT

Americans may be pardoned for believing that the office into which Mr. Wilson is inducted this week is the greatest public office in the world. They believe so, not merely because the United States is their country, and they naturally exalt the importance of its Chief Magistrate, but because the office itself in law and in fact has attached to it extraordinary powers and perhaps a still more extraordinary influence. According to the Constitution, the legislative powers of Congress are carefully limited and defined, and the judicial powers of the courts are subjected to legislative action, but the executive power is invested in the President without qualification. Moreover, the President, unlike the Federal judges, is elected to office, and, unlike the members of either house of Congress, he is elected by the voters of the whole Nation and represents in himself ninety million people. He has thus a power which in constitutional monarchies is divided between kings and prime ministers; and he has what neither king nor prime minister has —the directly expressed sanction of all the people.

The man, therefore, who for the time being is President of the United States is entitled to something more than the respect of all Americans; he is entitled to their confidence and their moral backing. In an American citizen respect for the President is a high form of self-respect; the confidence and support yielded to the President is an intelligent form of patriotism. Whatever the political opinion or partisan feeling of a man may be, he shows only common sense in subordinating it to that form of patriotism which is a desire for the success of an incoming President's Administration.

In particular, Americans have reason for respecting the man who this week is taking up for the first time the duties of the Presidency, and reason for confidence in him. Woodrow Wilson in intellectual power and in character is universally regarded as an altogether fit successor to the line of Presidents from the beginning to the present. Those who disagree with his political views, oppose his political acts, and question his political ability, can and do unite with those of his political faith in recognizing the fact that the people of the United States have brought honor and credit to democracy by choosing such a man.

Every American, therefore, wishes—or ought to wish—well to the new Administration. Success to this Administration will mean success to the country, and, what is no less important, a new justification for the principle of self-government. Every citizen can wish this Administration well the more heartily because it is going to be tested by certain unusually difficult problems. Without discussing them at length, we wish to point out here some of the more important of these problems that will call forth from the Administration the exertion of its best powers.

First, the Mexican situation. We place this first, not because it is most important, but because it is most acute and will call for the promptest decision. In this situation lies our relationship with all of Latin America. Indecision or error at this time may possibly affect to our hurt and to the hurt of our neighbors the course of republican institutions in this hemisphere for many years to come.

Second, the Philippine question. Though by no means just now acute, this question of our relationship with our wards in the Pacific may become so at any time, and a radical decision changing our relation might become of first importance because it would be one of those decisions that are in their nature irrevocable. A mistake there would be a mistake made for all time.

Third, the tariff question. In the minds of most American citizens the tariff question, as it confronts this Administration, is the most crucial one. According as this Administration deals successfully or unsuccessfully with the tariff, so, to a large extent, will it be judged. If it fails here, it will find it hard to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

secure popular support in its attempts to deal with other questions; if it succeeds, it will secure a chance to deal with more far-reaching problems. Though in this sense the tariff is the most crucial issue, it is not to our mind the most important.

Fourth, the currency. More intimately affecting the business of the Nation than even the tariff, and more widely affecting the prosperity of the ordinary man, is the question of banking and the currency. This question has been befogged by technicalities and by the conscious or unconscious misrepresentation of those whose interests would be affected for good or ill by a change in the system of currency and of banking. In no task affecting the material welfare of the Nation can Mr. Wilson and his Administration render greater service than by showing the way to the adoption of a sounder banking and currency system that can be approved by disinterested experts, and at the same time understood by the people. Until such a currency is established we shall suffer from those financial disturbances that interfere, not only with prosperity, but also with real political progress.

Fifth, conservation. Once more the problem of conserving our National resources is looming large. A concerted attack upon the resources now in control of the Nation, carried on for the purpose of serving special interests as distinct from the interest of the whole people, challenges the acuteness, skill, and firmness of the new President and his advisers. Those who believe that the best interests of the people will be served by giving to the strong and to the astute a fair chance to get and keep what they can, trusting that the people will profit incidentally from the generosity and self-interested enterprise of the inordinately successful, will not find Mr. Wilson, we believe, a complaisant person to deal with. The party, however, to which Mr. Wilson belongs, emphasizes the prerogatives of the States. It will require all the skill that Mr. Wilson can muster to steer a straight course towards real conservation, and at the same time retain the necessary support of all the members of his party. If once a material error is made here, it cannot be rectified. If once the mineral deposits, the forests, the water powers, pass beyond the control of the people, they will not be recovered to their control, as has been shown by the history of the anthracite fields of Pennsylvania and the millions of acres of overflowed land that years ago passed into the hands of the States, and from the States to special interests.

Sixth, the twofold problem of industry. The trust problem and the labor problem are two sides of one great problem. It is the overshadowing problem of the time—the problem of modern industry. The great corporations—impersonal, enormously powerful, efficient; machinery—extending indefinitely the reach of man's arms, enhancing indefinitely the nimbleness of man's fingers, immeasurably surpassing the fleetness of man's feet; and the consequent growth of great industrial cities—revolutionizing the family life that lies at the basis of civilization: these have brought forth problems that are bewildering in number, in complexity, and in insistence. Shall we try to undo what has been done, turn back to simpler ways and to older forces, or shall we harness the forces that have arisen and make them no longer our masters but our servants? Shall we keep our governmental power weak and distributed, and trust to weakening and distributing the industrial forces with which it has to deal, or shall we take advantage of those industrial forces and control them by a strengthened and concentrated governmental power? That is the heart of the trust question, of the labor union question, of the child labor question, of all our social and industrial questions so far as they concern the Government. It is with this great fundamental problem that the new Administration will have ultimately to deal. It is this question that will call for all the statesmanship that Mr. Wilson can call to his aid.

These are the problems in dealing with which every American ought, with all his heart, to wish the new President success.

THE RETIRING PRESIDENT

In November, 1908, Mr. Taft was elected President of the United States by a popular plurality of over a million votes. He carried practically a united North, East, and West, and had in the Electoral College three hundred and twenty-one votes. Democrats voted for him because he was pledged to a downward revision of the tariff; Republicans because he was pledged to the protective principle; Progressives because he had promised to "clinch the Roosevelt policies;" Conservatives because they hoped under his Administration for an end of the political

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agitation which had accompanied the introduction of those policies. Men who had voted for him and men who had voted against him joined in felicitations upon his election. The era was popularly characterized as the "Era of Good Feeling."

Two years later the Democrats carried the country in the Congressional elections. Four years later they elected their Presidential candidate, and carried enough of the States to insure a Democratic majority both in the Senate and in the House, while Mr. Taft was third in the race, carried only two States, and had in the Electoral College but eight votes.

This political revolution is the more extraordinary because there has been no great scandal, as there was in the second Administration of General Grant, and much which the country heartily approves has been accomplished. The successful prosecution of combinations in violation of the Sherman Act, the efficient carrying on of the Panama Canal nearly to completion, the creation of Postal Savings Banks and of the Parcel Post, are among the achievements which are to be credited to Mr. Taft's Administration; and he is personally liked by many of those who voted against him.

How will history account for this unprecedented political revolution?

History will not make much account of the unfortunate Payne-Aldrich Tariff Bill, or of the unsuccessful Canadian Reciprocity legislation, or of the failure of the General Arbitration Treaty. It will make a little more of the fact that Mr. Taft has allowed himself to be represented at times by men in whom the country has no confidence, and has given implied and sometimes direct support to political methods which, whatever sanction they may have from past tradition, are now condemned by the American people. These incidents have increased, but did not cause, the popular revolt against him and the party which he represented. The cause lies deeper.

That democratic movement which aims to transfer power and authority from the few to the many, which may be said to date from the close of the eighteenth century, entered at the close of the nineteenth century upon a new stage in its development. This progressive movement is, as The Outlook has heretofore pointed out, to be seen in different forms in every civilized country; not only in Christendom, but in Turkey, Persia, India, and China. It is to be seen in every department of life; in a New Theology both in the Protestant and the Catholic Church, in a New Education both in the public and the endowed schools, and in a New Industrialism in conflict with the old factory system. It is seen in this country in the popular acclaim given to Mr. Bryan, in the development of Socialism among the intellectual classes, in the organization of the Progressive party and the extraordinary vote given to it, in the nomination of Mr. Wilson forced upon a reluctant Convention by popular demand, and in the two Amendments to the American Constitution, one now before the States for ratification, the other already ratified, one intended to give increased political power to the many, the other to impose increased taxation on the few.

In this world movement Mr. Taft appears to have little faith. It seems to him full of danger. He has constantly and consistently urged the people of this country to defend the documents and the traditions of the past. He goes now to Yale to urge, as he himself says, these conservative views on lawyers who are growing up to make and interpret the laws for their country. Taking the Presidential vote in November as an indication of popular sentiment in this country, fully recognizing the fact that it is far from a perfect indication, and ignoring the votes cast for the Socialists and the Prohibitionists, it may be roughly said that ten million citizens have voted for progressive policies in general harmony with the world movement, and three and a half millions against those progressive policies. In other words, something like three-quarters of the people of the United States favor a further development of democracy, something like one-quarter wish to let well enough alone. The vote of the three-quarters was divided nearly equally between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Wilson; the vote of the one-quarter was given to Mr. Taft.

Mr. Taft may be right and the majority of the American people may be wrong. But Mr. Taft and the majority of the American people are not agreed; and in a representative government the people accept as their leaders only those who lead in the direction in which the people have already resolved to go. Long before 1860 Daniel Webster had warned the people of the United States that an anti-slavery policy would involve the country in civil war. Despite that warning, the people chose to follow Abraham Lincoln rather than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Daniel Webster, not because they thought Abraham Lincoln was either abler or more honest than Daniel Webster, but because they were determined that there should be no further extension of slavery with their sanction, express or implied, whatever the carrying out of that resolution might cost them. It is because the American people have resolved to secure a further development of democracy, both in government and in industry, that they have rejected the counsel and the leadership of Mr. Taft. If past traditions prevent, they mean to disregard the traditions; if historic documents prevent, they mean to amend the documents.

For the present, then, Mr. Taft and those who approve his views will be in the opposition. Such an opposition is needed. The abler its representatives the better for the country. It compels public discussion and prevents rash and heedless measures and ill-considered and dangerous experiments. Opposition will not carry us back to the rules and the methods of our fathers. It will not halt the movement toward a better distribution of political power and of wealth and its comforts; but it will compel a moderated and restrained progressivism. It will not prevent the progress of the new democracy; but it will render a needed and valued service by compelling over every step in that progress a careful deliberation.

MEXICO AND THE UNITED STATES

With the tragic death of Francisco Madero, compassed in the midst of treachery, there came to an end, not all effort, but at least one genuine, if unwisely directed, effort on behalf of greater industrial and political freedom. Porfirio Diaz, who began as a Liberator as well as a Liberal, had come to represent repression and oppression. The Liberal movement, which put him in power in 1876, swept by him and left him behind. That movement, which began as a revolt against the monarchical principle, developed into a movement against the injustice suffered by the peons and the landless. It was on behalf of the repressed and oppressed classes that Madero and the Maderistas directed their revolt against Diaz and drove him from the country. There is no doubt whatever that Madero was a lover of his kind. He belonged in that company of men who in all periods of history have been willing to sacrifice comfort, wealth, and life itself for the sake of extending an ideal to those who are pressed down by the hard reality of injustice.

Like many another idealist, however, Madero lacked that degree of force, of executive efficiency, of what men call drive, that brings ideals to pass.

This lack of aggression, of power to time one's blows, to hit hard, to maintain discipline, is characteristic of the Liberal movement generally. This is why a Liberal Government in England has so often failed in its foreign policy; so that the people have been willing to sacrifice some measure of their progress within the borders of the nation for the sake of maintaining, through the instrumentality of a Conservative government, England's true place in the family of nations. It is usually the aristocrats and the classes who have privileges to maintain that are led by Bismarcks. In the struggle between oligarchy and democracy the oligarchs have usually had the great advantage of organization and of a powerful, aggressive leadership. It is because democracy is impatient of discipline and unproductive of masterful leaders that such movements as Madero's have so often come to sad ends.

Now Mexico has to face the experience of discipline under men who seem to be devoid of ideals. There is little hope for democracy under a man who has acted as Huerta has, except as what he does incites the people to new rebellion.

If it were the function of the United States to go about the world bestowing democracy on distracted peoples, there would be no question that the present situation in Mexico afforded an excellent opportunity for the exercise of benevolence. Indeed, if any distracted people were to be delivered from themselves by an outside power, it might well be the people of Mexico. Democracy, however, does not come that way. If intervention on the part of the United States is ever necessary, it will not be because we ought to save the Mexicans in spite of themselves, but because our duty towards civilization demands it.

The demand of civilization for the exercise of intervention on our part might be shown in one of two ways. It might come in the form of evidence that the lives and property of foreign residents in Mexico were not being protected and could not be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

protected in any other way than by an armed force from this country. Or the demand of civilization might come in the form of explicit desire for our intervention by a large proportion of Mexicans.

No intervention can be justifiable except a successful intervention; and no intervention on behalf of the foreign residents can be successful that will increase their peril; no intervention on behalf of the Mexicans can be successful that will increase their distraction. At present there is no indication that any considerable body of Mexicans wish us to intervene. Whether there is any indication that the lives and property of foreign residents can be protected only by a United States force, those who are dependent purely on newspaper reports must, at least under present circumstances, leave to those who have better and more direct knowledge. When either form of demand becomes clear, the United States should not hesitate one moment about intervention. Until then there should be the utmost vigilance and the utmost restraint.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS

We hope that Justice Seabury's article, which appears elsewhere in this issue, discussing the Panama Canal question, will be widely read. It is a very able presentation of the facts and of the arguments of those who believe that the question is not one to be submitted to arbitration. Judge Seabury is not here discussing the general question of arbitration. As a matter of fact, he is heartily in favor of substituting the appeal to arbitration or judicial procedure for the appeal to arms in the settlement of international disputes wherever it can be done with justice and efficiency. His point is that, in this particular controversy with Great Britain, equity, precedent, and international law all combine to make Great Britain's plea for arbitration untenable.

Judge Seabury's argument is one which Sir Edward Grey, Great Britain's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, will, we believe, have to take into consideration. Though we do not agree with Judge Seabury's conclusion, we shall not endeavor to reply to his argument ourselves, but shall be content with briefly restating our own position.

We believe that Congress clearly had the right to exempt American coastwise vessels from tolls, that the exemption was not a violation of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, and that this contention can be argued with justice and moral conviction in a court of arbitration. But the fact that the United States is right is one of the most cogent reasons why we should be willing to submit our case to an arbitration court. The man who believes he is wrong and takes his case to court with the hope that he may obtain rights to which he is not justly entitled deserves contempt. The man who is convinced that he is right and is willing to submit his case to the courts at the risk of losing what he believes to be his rights, for the sake of preserving the peace and welfare of the community in which he lives, is entitled to the respect of that community.

The question which has arisen respecting the Panama Canal tolls is a question respecting the construction of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty. Great Britain is unanimously of the opinion that this question is not one of National honor or of domestic vital interest and does not, therefore, come within the exceptions specified in the Arbitration Treaty of 1908; this is the opinion of a considerable proportion of our fellow American citizens; it is the opinion entertained by Mr. Roosevelt, the President under whose Administration both the Arbitration Treaty of 1908 and the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty were negotiated—that is, in his judgment the question respecting the right of this country to exempt coastwise traffic from Panama Canal tolls does not come within the exceptions provided for in the treaty negotiated by his Administration in 1908.

Under these circumstances, although we recognize the force of Judge Seabury's reasoning, it seems to us that we shall better conserve the National honor and the vital interests of America by yielding the point, either consenting to arbitrate the question or consenting to repeal the exemption legislation, than by refusing to make any concession. To such concession there are two alternatives—war with Great Britain, which is unthinkable, or allowing the impression to go forth among foreign nations that we do not live up to our treaties, even as they are interpreted by the officials of our Nation who have made those treaties. It seems to The Outlook that such an impression would be far more injurious to the National honor and vital interests of America than any loss which America would suffer from imposing canal tolls on coastwise vessels.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LETTERS TO UNKNOWN FRIENDS

Several unknown friends ask me, How can the spiritual life be developed?

These questions indicate that the writers recognize the fact that spiritual life, like any other form of life, must be developed, or it dies, or, at best, remains dwarfed and stunted. A great many persons seem to imagine that the life of the spirit grows spontaneously; that one either has it or does not have it, and that is the end of the matter; that it is a kind of genius, given to some, denied to others. Doubtless there is some truth in these notions. Doubtless, as some men are more observant, and some more logical, and some more artistic than the average, so some are temperamentally more spiritual. But as every normal man has some power of observation, of reason, of artistic taste, so every normal man has some power of spiritual perception. It is developed in some easily, in others with difficulty; but it is not impossible to any one who desires it enough to take the necessary pains to cultivate it.

What do I mean by spiritual life? Max Müller defines religion as a perception of the infinite under such manifestations as are able to influence the moral character of men. By spiritual life I mean this perception of the infinite in finite manifestations.

Herbert Spencer says: "Unlike the ordinary consciousness, the religious consciousness is concerned with that which lies beyond the sphere of sense. A brute thinks only of things which can be touched, seen, tasted, heard, etc., and the like is true of the young child, the untaught deaf mute, and the lowest savage. But the developing man has thoughts about existences which he regards as usually intangible, inaudible, invisible, and yet which he regards as operative upon him." What I mean by the spiritual life is this thinking upon existences which are intangible, inaudible, invisible.

Paul says: "We look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen." By spiritual life I mean the ability to look upon the unseen, and the capacity to be inspired to noble living by the vision.

What can one who sees evidence of this power in others, or in himself, do to develop this power? I answer that question by asking another question: What can one do to develop any other power which he covets?

Your friend gets a joy and an inspiration from music which you do not get. You covet a like power. You go to a musical conservatory. You there associate with musical people, hear and try to appreciate the expressions of music, and you make some effort to give expression to music yourself, either by singing or by playing some instrument—if it were only by a mechanical piano-player. We are to develop our spiritual power in the same way.

I. Associate with people who have in some measure this spiritual power, or at least who have a desire for it. This is a chief advantage of going to church. Why not stay at home and read? One may get as much instruction as from a sermon. But one does not get fellowship. I go to church and join in singing, prayer, listening to the Bible with others who, like myself, unite in this service in order to get a clearer vision of the unseen realities. The very fact that they are common people like myself, whom I meet in the market, in the street, in neighborhood gatherings through the week, enhances the value of this fellowship. I am not an Episcopalian; but I particularly enjoy the Episcopal service because in it I have a sense of joining with many others in all quarters of the globe in the same expression of the same spiritual desires, and with unnumbered thousands who have used the same liturgy for hundreds of years in the past. It is this sense of human fellowship which makes any sincere worship inspirational to me, whether it is that of the Salvation Army, the Quaker meeting, the Roman Catholic cathedral, or the Jewish synagogue.

But one may get this sense of spiritual fellowship not only through a church service; he may get it through certain biographies. It is true that religious biographies are not always helpful, because they are not always genuine. It is true that the experiences which they record are sometimes abnormal and even morbid, and must be read with discrimination. So some art is crude in color and inharmonious in composition, and some music is sensuous, or sensational, or even vulgar. But that is no reason for refusing to study art or listen to music. To read such biographies as Robertson's "Life and Letters," the Life of Charles Kingsley, the Life of Francis of Assisi, the Life of Dr. Finney, sympathetically, with an open mind, is to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assure one's self of the reality of the spiritual vision which Max Müller and Herbert Spencer and the Apostle Paul have described in the quotations given above.

II. Not less important than this sympathetic contact with men and women who possess or seek to possess the spiritual life is the acquiring of familiarity with the expression of that life in devotional literature. As we learn to appreciate music by listening to music, and art by looking at pictures, and literature by reading the best books, so we learn to appreciate the spiritual life by reading the best expressions of that life which literature affords. It is well to have lying in one's bedchamber, to pick up in a ten minutes of resting, such a book, and to read a few sentences, or perhaps a few pages, from it every day. It is necessary to remember the difference between books about the spiritual life and books which are expressions of that life. Of course, to my thinking, the best of all books of religious experience is the Bible; only in using the Bible for this purpose one must distinguish between those portions of the Bible which are expressions of the spiritual life, such as the Psalms, parts of the four Gospels, parts of Paul's Epistles, and those portions of the Bible which are law, history, or literature, such as Deuteronomy, Kings, and the stories of Ruth and Esther. Next to the Bible I put certain books of devotion, such as the Book of Common Prayer, "Prayers from Plymouth Pulpit," "Prayers of the Ages." Next to these come books of a meditative character, such as the "Imitation of Christ," by Thomas à Kempis; "Holy Living and Holy Dying," by Jeremy Taylor; "Moments in the Mount," by Matheson; "Endeavors after the Christian Life," by Martineau. Next come books of devotional poetry, such as George Herbert's Poems, "Lyra Germanica," and Keble's "Christian Year."

But any reading of such literature, to be of value, must be meditative reading. It is useful only as it is food for thought and inspiration to life. One might as well read the daily paper as a devotional book, if he reads the devotional book as most of us read the daily paper. For example: You read, "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us." Stop and think. Has any one trespassed against you? If so, do you feel toward him as you wish your Father in heaven to feel toward you? If not, then change at once your attitude toward the wrong-doer. If you remind yourself of what is your duty toward your brother, only to resolve not to fulfill it, your devotional reading has been worse than useless. Or you read in Thomas à Kempis, "If thou canst not make thyself such as thou wouldst be, how canst thou have another to thy liking?" Stop; reflect. Are you more anxious to make over your husband or your friend than to make yourself over? If so, consider whether it is not better to abandon the first task and take up the second. The reading of devotional literature is valuable as an inspiration to life only as we follow the clues to life which it puts into our mind.

III. The third method of developing the spiritual life is beginning to practice the personal expression of such life as we possess. Paul says: "We know not what we should pray for as we ought." If this is true in your experience, if you find prayer difficult, take the expressions of devotion which literature affords you and make one of these your own. Select a Collect from the Book of Common Prayer, or one of Robert Louis Stevenson's prayers, or one of Mr. Beecher's, and offer it as your own. You do not begin by extemporizing music; you play what some one else has written. Pray as you play. Accept the devotional experience of another and make it your own. And if you cannot address it to God as a petition, if he seems too far away, or too obscure or chimerical or unknown, express it as a wish, an aspiration. Says Sabatier: "Perhaps a history of prayer would be the best history of the religious development of mankind. The history would be seen to commence in the crudest cry for help and to complete itself in perfect prayer, which, in the life of Christ, is simply submission to and confidence in the Father's will." Do not expect to begin your devotional life where Christ's earthly life culminates. Do not expect to make his prayer in Gethsemane yours at the very outset of your life.

To develop in one's self the spiritual life there are these three rules:

Familiarize yourself with the spiritual life of others.

Read, meditate, and apply to your own life the spiritual experiences of others.

Express simply and sincerely such spiritual life as you possess, even if you possess nothing more than an appreciation of spiritual life and a desire to possess it.

LYMAN ABBOTT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MONROE DOCTRINE

A POLL OF THE FOREIGN PRESS

MEXICO

THERE is chaos in Mexico. It affects Mexicans with misrule. It also affects Americans in Mexico. It affects all foreigners there.

Three generations ago we began to take a certain course concerning the republics of the American hemisphere. We need to take this course all the more when one of the republics is our next-door neighbor and when it lies between us and the Panama Canal.

Foreign newspapers, as well as our own, were quick to see this. For instance, a year ago, the Washington correspondent of the London "Times," speaking about Secretary Knox's journey to the Central American republics, and the closer relations which must be formed between the United States and them, remarked: "Even apart from the Canal, Central America and Mexico must now be the primary concern of those who are called upon to interpret and enforce the policy formulated by President Monroe."

For a fortnight the disasters of the Madero Government in Mexico specially imperiled the lives and property of many thousand foreigners. Most of them were Americans. Did we intervene by armed force? No. Why? First, because there has been no general attack upon foreigners as such, and thus our military protection of them was not absolutely required. Second, because most Americans in Mexico urged against it, pointing out that if we decided to intervene they would be killed before help could come, all Mexican parties would be united against us, and the establishment of law and order throughout the country would cost the service of, say, three hundred thousand men for a long time—"for ten years," thinks the London "Morning Post." That paper adds:

> It would be war in its most savage form that . . . would cost the United States enormously in lives and money; that would make all the world poorer, for millions of British, French, and German capital would be rendered nonproductive during the continuance of the war or swept away entirely by the destruction to property, and it would be years before the loss could be repaired.

Did the foreign governments intervene by armed force? No. Why? Because they respect our purpose and capacity in upholding the Monroe Doctrine.

A DEVELOPING DOCTRINE

What is the Monroe Doctrine? Its first terse outline was in President Monroe's Message of 1823:

> The American continents . . . are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European Powers.

This should be read in connection with a longer sentence in the same Message:

> With the governments which have declared their independence and maintained it . . . we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States.

The Monroe Doctrine has proved to be not only a continuous but also a developing policy. In 1845, when the Northwest boundary was an issue, President Polk extended the Doctrine to include acquisition by voluntary transfer or conquest of occupied territory. In 1912 it was extended by the following resolution, presented by Mr. Lodge, of Massachusetts, and passed by the Senate:

> When any harbor or other place in the American continents is so situated that the occupation thereof for naval or military purposes might threaten the communication or the safety of the United States, the Government of the United States could not see, without grave concern, the possession of such harbor or other place by any corporation or association which has such relation to another Government, not American, as to give to that Government the practical power of control for naval or military purposes.

In general this resolution was favorably received by the foreign newspapers. They admitted that, in case of hostilities, foreign corporations, if allowed a home on American soil, might ally themselves with foreign states and thus constitute a menace to international peace. A foremost exponent of British thought, the London "Spectator," averred that the Senate resolution was well within the purpose, if not within the actual words, of the original Monroe declaration. "Foreign corporations and foreign governments are not identical things, but in certain circumstances the one may easily be turned to the use of the other." The "Spectator" added:

> From the point of view of Great Britain, this action of the Senate need cause no uneasiness. With the principle of the Monroe Doctrine we are familiar, and Mr. Lodge's resolution does

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not really go beyond it. It is hardly possible that it should injure any one in this country, and it certainly serves as a protection against a real danger.

The enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine implies our Government's police power. Under that power we are expected to protect not only our own interests, but those of other countries, while we may not espouse their quarrels. Last summer, in Nicaragua, we showed what we could do in that respect. The present Mexican chaos has given opportunity, as was expected, to the foreign press to say exactly what it thinks of the Monroe Doctrine in general, and of its application to Mexico in particular.

THE BRITISH PRESS

Great Britain has now explicitly recognized the Monroe Doctrine. Recently Sir Edward Grey, the British Foreign Secretary, declared that "the Americans have a policy associated with the name of Monroe, the cardinal point of which is that no European or non-American nation should acquire fresh territory on the continent of America. If it be—as I think it must be—a postulate of any successful arbitration treaty of an extended kind that there should be no conflict, or possibility of conflict, between the national policies of the nations who are parties to it, this condition is assumed between us."

The Monroe Doctrine makes the United States "a mediator between the European and South American Powers," the "Spectator" points out. Suppose "France or Germany or Great Britain offended by some act of a South American state."

> The Monroe Doctrine offers a way out of these difficulties. It constitutes the United States a kind of buffer between the contending parties; it provides a means of reconciling our interests and theirs without demanding an unconditional surrender on either side. But it does not do this without laying a very real burden on the United States.

In this Mexican case the burden, to be worth bearing, *must* be heavy, in the "Spectator's" opinion, as it concludes: "What, as friends of America, we devoutly hope will not take place, is armed intervention with an inadequate force. That way lies madness."

The less well-informed London "Pall Mall Gazette" recently said that it would be time enough for the United States to warn off other nations from "Tom Tiddler's Ground" when the American Nation "practices what it preaches." We read:

> The action of the United States Government in annexing Porto Rico, acquiring the naval base at Guantanamo, and assuming control of the Canal Zone in Panama was doubtless justified by necessity. . . . But we think that international relations in regard to the American hemisphere would be made easier and the underlying principle of the Monroe Doctrine made more acceptable to other Powers if the opportunity were taken to reaffirm the determination of the United States to seek no further territorial expansion, and to avoid the same kind of colorable acquisition of places convenient for naval bases which the Senate declares it would view with "grave concern" on the part of other nations.

Evidently the editor was unaware of the reported statements of our Secretaries of State that we seek no further territorial expansion. Now, however, regarding Mexico, he says that if we should determine to send forward the troops assembled in Galveston no objection should come from "those who hold that the assertion of that [the Monroe] doctrine carries with it a corresponding obligation to maintain a decent standard of law and order in the states to which it applies."

In the same strain the Leeds "Mercury" says that the question now is, What will the United States do to act up to the Monroe Doctrine and to put a stop to the horrors that continue to be enacted in Mexico? The "Mercury" concludes that "the United States will not tolerate the interference of European nations in the control of Southern republics, and it is only right she should herself act when matters reach such a pass as now prevails in Mexico."

"Threats have been freely used in the United States that the murder of ex-President Madero would mean intervention," chronicles the Manchester "Courier," and concludes: "We do not believe that this will be the case."

"We can well believe that President Taft is sincere," says the London "Westminster Gazette," "when he says that he sees no cause for intervention in the 'deplorable occurrence of Señor Madero's death.'"

The Birmingham "Post" seems alone among foreign newspapers in uttering the warning that the moment our troops enter the country "the Monroe Doctrine controversies will be rearoused in some form or another and there will be the obvious risk of America's action being misunderstood and resented in Europe."

THE CONTINENTAL PRESS

That risk seems to be reduced to a minimum, if we may believe the papers published

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the continent of Europe. Certainly their tone is strikingly different from that of fifteen years ago, just before the Spanish War began. But in one respect their comment now is the same as then, namely, that "the Monroe Doctrine is as strong as are the American army and navy, and no stronger."

With regard to Mexico, the general impression abroad is that some kind of intervention is ultimately inevitable, and that without it Mexico will degenerate into the condition of a Central American Republic, with a continuous succession of revolts.

German comment has a special interest because German newspapers long treated the Monroe Doctrine as a "dog-in-the-manger" policy; that is to say, they accused us of refusing to accept our responsibility for order in South and Central America, and declining to let any European nation accept such responsibility. As to present-day Mexico the German papers are pessimistic. Ten years ago the "Berliner Tageblatt" thus put itself on record: "It cannot be too often repeated that, whether the Monroe Doctrine is a part of the international law or not, we recognize it not only because we must, but as a matter of principle"—up to that time the most explicit admission recorded in Germany. The "Tageblatt" now proceeds to apply it to the following conditions:

It is improbable that out of such atrocities, which can exist only in half-civilized states, permanent peace and order can be developed. It cannot be denied that the lawlessness with which Huerta inaugurated his régime may lead to the worst anarchy Mexico has known in thirty years.

A real revolution brought Madero to the head of the Government, but Huerta governs only through terror.

Should it come to events affecting the international status of Mexico, endangered Mexicans cannot blame any one outside of their own country. They have shown little capacity for self-government.

The Berlin "Vossische Zeitung" thinks the outlook for peace and the restoration of order less to-day than ever: "In North and South of the republic reign murder and lawlessness. There is no 'strong man,' so Mexico is surely steering toward a state similar to that of Cuba." Reverting to the Monroe Doctrine, "Tante Voss's" view is that "no logical objections can be raised to the doctrine." The paper adds:

It is for North America a matter of National sentiment and National business, and any attack on it from this side of the ocean would be mere tilting at windmills. Since France's luckless adventure in Mexico there has been no instance of an attempt to upset the doctrine during the last hundred years. On the contrary, European possessions on the American hemisphere have been steadily dwindling by revolution and sale.

THE JAPANESE PRESS

In Asia the most interesting views are, of course, those of the Japanese papers. The "Nichi-Nichi," of Tokyo, for instance, is pleased that our influence is steadily extending over Latin America. "If the Latin-American republics prosper and progress under the protection of the Monroe Doctrine," we are told, "Japan has every reason to be thankful to the United States; for the prosperity of those sister republics will doubtless prove a potent auxiliary to the extension of our trade across the Pacific." The Tokyo paper adds that Japan has no territorial ambition "either in Mexico or in South America," and that her aspirations on the American continent are purely commercial. The Tokyo "Jiji" takes the same view as does the "Nichi-Nichi" concerning the Monroe Doctrine's status, and in particular concedes that it deserves respect on the part of foreign Powers because the Latin-American republics seem willing to acquiesce in the influence of the United States.

THE SOUTH AMERICAN PRESS

Most interesting of all comment, however, is that of the Latin-American press, because Latin America is chiefly affected by the Monroe Doctrine. The views of South American papers are summed up by "La Tribuna," of Buenos Aires, Argentina, and "El Mercurio," of Valparaiso, Chile. "La Tribuna" rejoices in the end of the Mexican crisis. It fears, however, that fresh trouble may arise, provoking intervention by the United States. Then South American nations might protest. "El Mercurio" declares that Mexico's condition inspires pity, but that President Taft's reply to Madero's letter concerning intervention was sensible, and that the present situation in Mexico prevents serious action by the United States, whose Government wishes to show itself just and magnanimous for both political and commercial reasons. The newspaper thus concludes: "We do not believe in intervention, but, should it come, we must inquire before judging whether it is just or necessary or inevitable or humanitarian."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"WHO BROKE THE WINDOW?"

THE DEBATE IN LEE'S CREEK SCHOOL

WHEN we asked our readers, "Who Broke the Window?" we did not know it was going to become a National question. Apparently, however, if we can judge from the letters we have received, it has aroused as much interest as the trust question, or the tariff question, or the conservation question. We ought not to have been surprised, for it concerns fundamental questions of conduct and character.

That this is a National question is indicated by the fact that letters have come to us from every part of the country: from the northeast corner in Maine, from the southwest corner in California, from the northwest corner in Washington, from the southeast corner in Florida. One newspaper at least, the Detroit "Journal," has taken up the question and has opened its columns for the opinions of its readers. We heartily welcome the Detroit "Journal" to the company of those who are discussing this question all over the Nation.

When our readers, after last considering this question in council, dispersed, we said that we might call them together again to consider the question if a sufficient number of them wished us to do so. When a crowd gathers outside the closed doors of a meeting-place, it is pretty good evidence that they wish to meet. Such a crowd has certainly been gathering, and we are going to throw open the doors.

This week, however, we rule out adults. The only participants this time will be those who probably have the most intimate acquaintance with the subject—boys and girls in school.

For the benefit of those readers who have not followed the discussion from the beginning—and in order to follow it with interest and profit it is perfectly possible for any one to join our readers' council at this point—we here restate the questions:

Good and Bad are two boys, each fourteen years of age. They attend the same school. One day Bad said to Good, "I am going to throw a snowball through the window." Good made no reply. Bad threw the snowball and broke the window, and Good saw him do it. The next morning at school the teacher asked the pupils singly and privately the questions, "Do you know who broke the window?" and "Who broke the window?"

1. What should Good say when the teacher asked him, "Do you know who broke the window?"
2. What should Good say when she asked him, "Who broke the window?"
3. Should the teacher have asked the boy these questions?
4. Should the teacher have the same right as the court in compelling Good to tell?
5. Modern American schools are rapidly adopting systematic instruction in ethics. In your opinion, should children throughout the public schools be *taught* that it is their duty to tell the truth about wrong-doing when questioned by a competent authority?

The first part of the discussion will be carried on by a class in English in the Wayne High School at Lee's Creek, Ohio. Lee's Creek is, we understand, on a rural free delivery route, but it is the seat of the Wayne Township Centralized Schools. When The Outlook which presented this question reached that part of Ohio, the teacher of that class, Miss Winifred Richmond, put the matter before her pupils. We shall let her here tell our readers what she did:

THE TEACHER'S LETTER

I am a teacher of English in a country high school. When the article "Who Broke the Window?" was published in The Outlook a few weeks ago, it occurred to me to use it as a subject for debate in a second-year class consisting of ten boys and ten girls, ranging in age from fifteen to seventeen years.

Accordingly, I read the statement of the case in the first division of the article, and the question was stated, "Resolved, That Good should have told the teacher, when she asked him, who broke the window."

Two boys and one girl immediately expressed themselves as believing the affirmative, two boys and two girls as believing the negative; the others, on the spur of the moment, were undecided, but four boys and two girls were willing to debate the affirmative whether they believed it or not, and every one else was willing to debate the negative. So the teacher appointed an equal number on the negative. The debate came off the next day and was won by the negative. The pupils were then asked to prepare papers embodying their views upon the question. I am sending you a representative paper from each side, in the belief that they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are of interest as giving answers from the view-point of the children themselves.

Only twenty per cent of the girls thought that Good should have told, against forty per cent of the boys.

The boys and girls wish me to request The Outlook to indicate its answer to the question. The magazine itself is a sort of *sine qua non* in our English and History classes, and they have much respect for its opinion, though, being normal adolescents, they do not always agree with it.

WINIFRED RICHMOND,
Principal Wayne High School.
Lee's Creek, Ohio.

The Outlook appreciates the friendship of these young people. It has already given its answers in the issue for February 15. After receiving Miss Richmond's letter we asked her to send all the other compositions. From those compositions we here reproduce before our readers, as best we can, the debate of the Wayne High School pupils, first presenting the two compositions the teacher refers to in her letter.

FOR THE AFFIRMATIVE

Resolved, That Good should have told on Bad.

I think Good should have told on Bad because breaking the window of the schoolhouse was a willful injury to public property, which is against the law. The teacher was doing her duty in trying to find out who committed this act—and how was she to find out if Good did not tell, provided Bad would not confess?

If some one were to purposely break a window of your home, would you not be grateful to your next-door neighbor, who chanced to see the offender do it, for telling you who did it? Of course you would! Well, then, Good should take the same attitude of loyalty toward his school and be willing to tell who broke the window.

However, it is very unfortunate for the affirmative side that the story says that Bad told Good that he was going to throw the snowball and Good did nothing to prevent his doing so. He should have tried to stop him and show him that it was not right.

Respect for the teacher and her authority should have prompted Good to tell who broke the window *when* the teacher asked him. The teacher in a school should have the same right to exact the truth from pupils that a court does from witnesses. A certain well-known historian has said of the Roman youths that into them the virtues of obedience and deference for authority were instilled. When the youth became a citizen, obedience to magistrates and respect for law were with him an instinct, and, indeed, almost a religion. The exercising of the parental authority taught the Roman how to command as well as obey—how to exercise authority with wisdom, moderation, and justice. Let us apply this to the case of Good and Bad. Good will show his respect for authority in telling on Bad, and Bad will learn that he cannot do mean little things for spite whenever he wishes. Both boys will learn lessons which will help to make them better citizens when they are older.

It is very necessary for every State to have its laws. The next necessity is to have them enforced, and citizens of the State (if they are good ones) take pride in living up to them, and helping to enforce them. A school is very like this. It must have its laws or rules; the teacher must do her best to enforce them, and the pupils should take pride in doing what they can to enforce the laws of their school. Good will be doing nothing more than his part if he tells. He should take pride in doing what he can in enforcing the school laws. He is learning to become a good citizen.

Good might be helping to keep some one's good character by telling on Bad, for might not the teacher suspect an innocent party, if he did not tell? In asking each one the question, "Do you know who broke the window?" and upon receiving negative answers, she might suspect some one not only of breaking the window but also of a falsehood. Thus some one's character might be marred in the teacher's eyes.

Very probably Good will lose Bad's friendship, but I do not think that would be such a great loss. Does it seem profitable to be popular with every one? I think not. Good may be called a "tattletale," but if he hesitates on account of that he is a coward. He need not rush to get a chance to tell; but when the teacher asks him privately, the thing for him to do is to tell who broke the window. HELEN, Age 15.

FOR THE NEGATIVE

Resolved, That it was not right for Good to tell on Bad.

First I want to ask this question: If Good was good and Bad was bad, what was Good

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

doing in Bad's company? Did any of the great men, such as Washington, ever do anything that they knew to be wrong? The answer must be, Yes. And you will wonder why. Simply because when Washington was a boy didn't he take the hatchet and cut down the cherry tree? Now you all know this to be true, and you will be compelled to answer, Yes. Now I will again ask the question: Why did he do this? He must have been a boy of some size, or at least have been large enough to know right from wrong. Now perhaps this boy didn't really intend to break the window, and perhaps he didn't realize the danger there was involved in throwing the snowball. Just imagine yourself to be in Bad's position for a while. Would you enjoy going to school if you knew that some one was always standing around watching to see what you did, and the minute you made a crooked move they would run and report to the teacher? And, furthermore, any one that is always telling the teacher everything that happens is never liked by the majority of the scholars, and it is very seldom that a teacher holds a scholar in very high esteem who always has something to tell. When the teacher asked Good the question, "Do you know who broke the window?" he should have said, "I do." But when the teacher asked, "Who broke the window?" he should have said, "I positively refuse to tell, because I have more respect for my fellow-student than to tell on him and cause him to undergo some severe punishment." If Good had told on Bad and kept on telling every time he was asked he would probably cultivate a habit in himself so that he would want to tell everything he knew. And after a time he would become so that no one would put any confidence in him, and he would be enrolled in the circle of village gossipers. EDISON, Age 15.

Now we shall ask the other members of the class in English to state their views for the benefit of the assembled readers of The Outlook.

ONE POINT OF GENERAL AGREEMENT

By way of introduction it may be said that, with possibly only one exception, all the members of the class, whether they are arguing for the negative or the affirmative, appear to agree that Good made a mistake in not remonstrating with Bad after Bad had announced that he was going to break the window before he threw the snowball. As one of the pupils says: "Good should have tried to persuade him not to do it, and he should have told Bad that if the teacher should ask him who broke the window he would tell her; but Good did not make any reply, and it is said that 'silence gives consent.'" As another of these pupils expresses it, when Good stood by and watched Bad throw that snowball he was in the wrong almost as much as Bad. Both of these take the negative side of the proposition. The same view is taken by debaters on the affirmative. For instance: "Good and Bad were of the same age, and Bad knew as well as Good that he ought not to break the window." Only one pupil—who, by the way, takes the affirmative side—believes that Bad should not have remonstrated. "If Good would have tried to persuade him not to throw the snowball," argues this pupil, "Bad would have called him a coward and would not have paid any attention to him. And besides, Bad was as old as Good, and if he had been caught in his wrongdoings before this he would not have thrown the snowball just to break the window."

The question whether Bad and Good were friends or merely schoolmates seems to have some bearing upon the issue in the minds of some of the debaters.

The pupils take up, as will be seen, various aspects of the question. Each one contributes his or her special point to the course of the argument. In arguing the matter at the school each of these pupils stated the arguments in full. It is not, however, necessary that there should be here the repetition of arguments that was necessary when the compositions were submitted. The negative and affirmative will be presented alternately, and as the negative is one in the majority, that side begins and ends the discussion.

GETTING HIS NEIGHBORS DOWN ON GOOD

First, Theodore, age sixteen, states his views on the negative side:

"In the first place, the teacher should not have asked Good to tell on Bad, for that would get the pupils down on Good, and the teacher should have more respect for Good than to get his playmates down on him, as they surely would be if he told on Bad.

"If the teacher had asked Good, he should

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not have told on Bad, even if it did make her mad. It would be better to have the teacher mad at you than all the boys, for you don't generally have the teacher very long and you have to grow up with your playmates and they finally become your fellow-citizens. And they would not forget the way you told on them when a boy. Therefore you could not make a success in life, for nobody can make a success with his neighbors mad at him.

"Of course the older people might not like Good if he did not tell, but what makes the difference? When you grow up to be a man the older people will be dead and turned to dust, and the fellows you went to school with will still be with you. Of course I don't mean by the preceding statement that you don't need the friendship of the older people, for you do need everybody's friendship, but in this case it would be paying too big a price for the older people's friendship."

THE CRIME OF DESTROYING PUBLIC PROPERTY

Next, in the affirmative, Ammi argues as follows:

"I think Good should have told on Bad because the school-house window is public property, and in destroying public property Bad is committing a crime, and a criminal deserves to be caught and punished.

"If, instead of throwing the snowball through the window, Bad was seen by one of your friends to be setting your barn on fire, and your friend told you about it, you would not after that call your friend a tattler, and you would be likely to have the boy severely punished; because he was committing a crime—a crime of destroying property other than his own.

"It may be said that Good would lose the friendship of Bad if he tells on him. If Good is as good as his name implies, it would be just as good if not better for Good not to have Bad's friendship, because, in being in Bad's company, Bad would doubtless extend his bad influence over Good.

"It would also be better for Bad to be told on, as he would very likely be punished and would doubtless reform his ways and lead himself to a better life than the life of criminals.

"The teacher should have the same right as the court in compelling Good to tell, because the school-house was placed in her care and it was her place to find out who disfigured the building and to punish him because he was a criminal."

STANDING UP FOR ONE'S FRIENDS

Not so, says Bertha M., age fourteen:

"I do not think that the teacher has the same right that a court does in compelling a person to tell. She could find out some other way, or if she did not find out she should scold the pupils and tell them that that was against the rules, and ask them kindly not to do it again. I am sure she would have better results in asking this way than by compelling some one to tell. She may try to compel the pupils to tell, but that would not do any good although she would punish them.

"To the boy who stands up for a friend it makes no difference if the teacher does say he is a coward for not telling; he is always the one respected by his friends.

"I do not think a teacher should have asked the boy these questions, for not many boys want to be a witness against their schoolmates."

MUTUAL CONFIDENCE, PRO AND CON

Mildred, age fourteen, whom we have already quoted as being practically the only one of the pupils who thinks that Good would not have been justified in remonstrating with Bad, argues on the affirmative side:

"Good should have said, 'Bad broke the window,' because Good knew. If he had not told, Bad would think Good would always shield him in any mischief he would attempt, and thus Good was harming Bad instead of helping him to become better."

Marguerite, age sixteen, disagrees, on the ground that confidence should not be violated:

"When a pupil tells on his playmates he is not held in high estimate by the pupils. For instance, if I should tell some one something I did not want told, and if she told it, I surely would not think as much of her afterwards and would be very careful what I told her. I don't think the teacher should have the same right as the court of compelling Good to tell. If he decided he would not tell, no one could force him to tell, although he might be severely punished. I don't think the teacher should have asked these questions

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but should have found out some other way."

Fred, age seventeen, apparently does not agree with the view that keeping silence in such a case would violate confidence. He says:

"The pupils would not have very high standards if they would get down on a boy for telling something that was a damage to the school-house. The teacher should have asked the boy this question if she had no other way to find out. This was destroying the school-house and costing money to get it repaired. And if the teacher did not find out who did this and punish him she would be to blame. Bad was destroying public property, and if he was in court he would be compelled to tell what he knew. So I think he ought to be punished if he did not tell what he knew."

J. E. L., on the other hand, condemns such action very strongly:

"It looks very sneaking and low-down for one boy to tell on another. Good should have answered, 'I have nothing to say,' when the teacher said, 'Who broke the window?' Why? Because the teacher is paid to teach that school and keep order, not to run around and ask one or two everything that happens. She should watch them and find out herself."

SHOULD BAD GET MAD?

Jessie, age fifteen, believes that Good's loyalty to the school and his self-interest should lead him in the same direction:

"I think Good should have told on Bad. If Good had any respect for the school and was loyal to it, he would have told on Bad. When Bad told Good he was going to throw the snowball through the window, he should have tried to discourage Bad from throwing it. Although it might have made Bad mad because Good told on him, it would have been better for Bad. Bad should not get mad, because it was for his own good and not for any one else. The teacher should have asked the boy these questions, because she had no other way of finding out who broke the window; and if Good had not told on Bad the teacher might have thought he did it, and I am sure Good would not have wanted to receive the punishment that rightly belonged to Bad. Even though he received a black eye from telling, the honor of the school is of more importance than the black eye. I do not think Good would be called a 'tattletale' for telling on Bad, because the breaking of the window was a destruction of public property. He might have lost the friendship of Bad, but such friendship as that of Bad's is not worth having."

WHAT GOOD SHOULD HAVE DONE

Bertha, age seventeen, thinks that the fact that Good did not interfere in the first place was the controlling factor:

"I think Good had plenty of time to persuade Bad not to throw the snowball, or at least try to tell him it was not right. Good should then have told Bad he would have to tell who threw the snowball if the teacher should ask him. I think it would have been perfectly all right for Good to tell after he had told Bad he would have to if the teacher should ask him. I think Good should say he knew who broke the window; but when she asked him, 'Who broke the window?' he should have refused to tell because he knew Bad was going to throw the snowball and didn't say anything to him. When the teacher saw he did not want to tell on his mate, she should not have tried to make him tell who broke the window. I think it was all right for the teacher to have asked the boy these questions, but I think she should not have tried to compel the boy to tell."

THE SCHOOL AND THE COURT

Everett, age fifteen, says that if Good stood quietly by and made no remonstrance, "he was almost as bad as Bad." On the other hand, if Good had remonstrated and had been ignored, he would have been "perfectly justified in telling on Bad," although it would "be very hard to tell on a schoolfellow." He continues:

"If Good were afraid to tell for fear of being called a tattletale or getting whipped by Bad, that would show him to be a coward. I do not think that the teacher should ask these questions of the boy unless it were absolutely necessary.

"I do not think that the teacher should have the same right as the court in compelling Good to tell, as these two institutions are widely different. The purpose of the court is to find out all about any crime that has been perpetrated, while the purpose of the school is to educate the children. Therefore nobody but the court should have the power to compel a person to tell anything they might want to know."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This distinction that Everett makes between a court and a school is one which no other person arguing in the affirmative, so far as we remember, has made. It prevents him from believing that Good should be made to tell, though it does not prevent him from believing that Good should tell voluntarily.

Naomi, age sixteen, on the other hand, who notes this distinction, comes to quite the opposite conclusion :

" I don't think it is right for pupils to tell on each other. And it was not right for the teacher to ask her pupils these questions, because she should not expect so much out of her pupils, and not depend upon her pupils to find out about a crime one of them committed, because it is her business to keep her eyes open and know these things for herself."

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

Earl, aged sixteen, places the emphasis on the necessity for protecting property rights. He declares that Bad was old enough to know that what he did was wrong. " By doing so he was committing the crime of ' the Destruction of Property.' " As to Good's responsibility, this pupil argues :

" If he had told who it was, and Bad had been corrected, it would probably have broken him of such mean habits. On the other hand, if he had told a falsehood about it and Bad had not been found out, he would probably have gone on in this way and would in most cases land in the penitentiary. In my opinion, children should be taught to tell the truth when asked."

Imo, aged fifteen, does not think that Good has any such responsibility in the matter as the teacher has, arguing :

" He should say he did not care to tell because he did not think it was right to tell on schoolmates and it wasn't his place to inform the teacher of the wrongs going on in the school. I think it was all right for the teacher to ask these questions, and if he cared to tell all right, but I do not think it would be right for her to try to compel him to tell if he did not want to."

Hazel, aged sixteen, seems to feel, however, the importance of the teacher's responsibility :

" I think it was all right for the teacher to ask the boy these questions, for perhaps she had no other way to find out. Although it would have made Bad mad at Good for telling, he would not have stayed mad at him very long. Even though Good would be called a tattletale, that would not have made a bit of difference to Good. If Good had told the teacher he did not know who broke the window he would be telling a falsehood, and therefore would not be any better than Bad ; and of course any one would not want to be compared with any boy that was mean enough to break a window with a snowball."

BAD'S FEELINGS

Frank, on the other hand, has consideration for Bad's feelings, and at the same time thinks that the teacher's confidence in her pupils might be injured by Good's telling. Says he :

" I do not believe that Good should have told, because if he had intended to tell he ought to have said something to Bad and given him warning. If Bad had wanted it told, I think he would have told it himself. If the teacher would ask Good about it, he should tell part he knew, but not all. It was all right for the teacher to ask and find out if she could. The teacher would not think any more of him if he had told all about it, for she would be afraid of telling him anything privately or a secret. She would be afraid of him telling it. If Good had been suspicioned, Bad should have come in and stood part of the blame and shame. If Good had told, perhaps part of his friends would be Bad's friends, and this would have caused a hard feeling among all. Good's friends were not afraid to put confidence in him. They were not afraid he would tell if he was asked, for he was not that kind of a boy."

THE GOLDEN RULE VARIOUSLY APPLIED

Burch, age seventeen, puts the emphasis not on the school property as others do, not on loyalty to the school discipline, not on Good's self-interest, but on the reformation of Bad—a reformation that is worthy of sacrifice on Good's part :

" If Bad kept on doing these little tricks, and was not corrected, he would not make the right kind of man for a citizen of the United States. If Good told on Bad, Bad was punished and in most cases would not have to be again. Good would probably lose Bad's friendship for a while, but after a time they would be friends again."

Bryan, age sixteen, now concludes the discussion with an argument on the negative by an appeal to the Golden Rule :

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Resolved, That Good should not have told on Bad. Why? Because Bad's feelings might be very sensitive on this subject, and in doing so Good might have hurt him so much that Bad would have an ill feeling towards Good. Again, if Good was in Bad's place, would Good want Bad to tell on him?"

With many thanks to these school-boys and school-girls for their contribution to the debate, The Outlook concludes this discussion by the young people themselves with two pieces of testimony—one from North Carolina by way of Chicago, the other from Massachusetts:

A NORTH CAROLINA SCHOOL-BOY

I am a boy seventeen years old. My parents being dead ever since I was two years old, I was raised by an aunt. She taught me to be very religious, and I soon got the "tell-tale" habit.

I went to school in a town in the Piedmont section of North Carolina.

When the teacher asked who did this and that, I was about the first one to up and tell on some one. I was disliked by the boys, and was never chosen to take part in any ball games or anything of the sort.

I noticed one phrase in the issue of February 15. It was this: "I prefer not to tell."

Upon being teased by my mates, I adopted this phrase, or something similar to this.

I soon saw the difference. I was among those chosen for the games, and was liked by a majority of the students.

I did not end a reckless boy, nor was I a "tattletale."

No one, not even the teacher, likes a "scab" or "tattletale."

So I think it advisable for a boy to act in this way: If he knows, to tell the teacher he would rather not tell.

If he don't know, to say he don't, and stick to it. I do not think it right for the teacher to punish the whole class and force a fellow to make enemies for the sake of a window-glass.

A teacher generally has her suspicions as to who did this and that; if she would keep a lookout for the fellow she suspicioned and not punish the innocent. But most teachers are too young and inconsiderate.

It is the BOY *you are trying to save, not the window.*

I have adopted this plan, although I have not been to school for two years. I am now employed by a world-wide famous firm of Chicago, and I think myself very fortunate.

E. H.

Chicago, Illinois.

THE ERASER AND THE WINDOW

The discussion of the question, "Who Broke the Window?" has interested me greatly. I am a high school boy graduating this year, and even in high school the problem is most perplexing. The other day, during lunch period, a boy on one side of the room threw an eraser at another boy near the window. The missile missed its mark and broke the window.

The teacher came in soon afterward and noted the broken window. He called the class to order and asked this question:

"Who broke that window?"

Now the boy who had broken it had gone out of the room, intent on avoiding suspicion, and to this query there was no answer.

The teacher repeated the question, and again there was no answer. Then he asked:

"Is there anybody who knows anything about breaking the window?" I had debated this question over in my mind before it had been put, and had come to my decision.

I raised up my hand and was called to the desk.

"What is it you know?" inquired the teacher.

"I know all about it," I said.

"Tell me about it," the teacher said.

I thought for a moment before I spoke. Then I said:

"I don't want to say anything about it. Somebody broke it. I don't want to get him into any trouble."

"You may have to tell," said the teacher.

"Oh, no!" I replied; "I don't believe I'll say anything."

Soon afterward I was sent back to my seat, hardly knowing whether I had done right or wrong. When I got home I put the question to my parents. They agreed that I should have answered the teacher's second question as I did, but the second one of the five puzzled both.

"Why didn't you tell who had broken the window?" asked my father.

"Well," I said, "I think it would be treating that fellow mean. It was his question. It was his part to do what he wished about it. I had nothing to do with it. It was really none of my business."

"Yes," said father, "but suppose you

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were walking home from school and saw a man assault another man, wouldn't you think it your duty to tell what you had seen when asked?"

"Surely," I agreed, after some hesitation; "but the school-room isn't a court-room, is it?"

"Well, what do you think?" replied father. "Aren't there rights and privileges to be settled in a school and nowhere else? Aren't the teachers invested with as much authority over their pupils as magistrates have over the people?"

"I guess you're right," I said. "I can see where, by all the measurements of the law, I ought to have told the teacher the name of the boy who broke the window. But isn't there something else in school life not found outside in the world? Isn't there a feeling of union, trust, and simplicity there that stands directly in the way of such an answer? The natural and right thing for me to have done, at least right in the eyes of discipline, would have been for me to betray that fellow's trust in his companions; and that, it seems to me, would have savored of a quality that Americans despise above everything else, faithlessness and traitorism. Yes, the teacher had the right to ask these questions, but had not the right to compel me to tell."

"There's something in that," said father. "To question two you say 'Yes,' though, eh?"

I nodded.

"To question three you say 'Yes;' and to the fourth question what do you say? Has the teacher the same right as a court in compelling you to tell?"

"Father," I replied, "the average schoolboy knows but very little about court and the administration of justice. All his associations tend to make him opposed to the right of any one to make him speak when he doesn't want to. Everybody hates a squealer, no matter who he is. And this is the soil where the teacher must sow his seed. To a boy's mind, the question, or rather demand, that he should 'squeal' on his fellow is absolutely unjust. I don't believe there's a boy in our school who will tell on another boy unless he wishes to do him harm for some reason. To a boy's mind there is no great virtue in telling about some one else's fault. Let them take care of their own transgressions. Hands off! At least give a fellow a chance to confess his sin! If you can't help him up, don't pull him down. No, emphatically, is my answer to the fourth question."

Father was silent, but after a minute he said:

"The boy's right, mother." And then, "Do you think children ought to be taught to"—father fumbled for his paper before finishing, abruptly—"tell on some one else?"

"No," I replied. "That question isn't a question of law and order, it is a question of morals. There is in every boy's heart a higher law, a law of loyalty, faithfulness which grown-ups seem to lack. Any attempt to prevent this ideal would doubtless result disastrously on the boy's character. His ideals are a bit shady, to say the least; his convictions are slowly shaping themselves into his character, which belongs wholly to him; but if there is one virtue, one quality, which stands out above all others in the boy's mind, it is the inborn tendency to stay with a comrade through toil and suffering, and to join with him in despising the squealer, the quitter. And if children are taught that this feeling is wrong and foolish, what will become of their ideals that sooner or later make the man? What is it that we admire in all great men any more than their loyalty to their fellows? True, their loyalty never leads them into wrong-doing with a friend; but can this be said of the culprit's companions? Father, let me tell you, no good results ever come from a squealer in school. He violates all that holds boys together, and, in addition, deprives the culprit of his opportunity to come out, confess, and prove himself a man. And no one will admire him any more for his courage in confessing than his loyal comrades, and this same loyalty has brought forth in this way many confessors in our school. A comrade's hearty approbation is the best goad anybody can have, and everybody, schoolboy or outside, values it in this way.

P. M. ARNOLD.

Dorchester, Massachusetts.

In a later issue The Outlook will publish a series of incidents which a number of readers are ready to tell out of their own experiences that will throw light on this very interesting question of conduct.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PANAMA CANAL

SHALL IT BE AMERICAN OR ANGLO-AMERICAN?

BY SAMUEL SEABURY

JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

"I commend an American canal, on American soil, to the American people."—GENERAL GRANT.

"The policy of this country is a canal under American control. The United States cannot consent to surrender this control to any European power."—PRESIDENT HAYES.

INTRODUCTION

AS early as 1550 the idea of a canal which should unite the waters of the Atlantic and of the Pacific was publicly discussed. From that time until the present idealists have dreamed and statesmen have struggled to bring about its realization. Difficulties—physical, financial, and political—have barred the pathway which led to achievement. The treaty which the United States made with the Republic of Panama removed the legal and political obstacles in the way of commencing the task which had been so long in contemplation. Since that time the United States has acted with characteristic energy. One of the greatest engineering achievements of mankind is being carried to a successful conclusion. The cost of the Canal to the Government of the United States will exceed $400,000,000. In the near future vessels of commerce will pass through the Canal from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It is estimated that within a year from the time it is opened a net tonnage of over 10,000,000 tons will use the Canal. Of this tonnage, not quite one-quarter will be engaged in American coastwise trade. The Panama route will have a monopoly of the traffic of Hawaii and of the west coast of North and South America, with the exception of a small part of the trade of southern Chile, although it must compete with other routes for the large and valuable commerce of Pacific Asia and of Australia. The Canal will decrease the distance from New York to San Francisco about eight thousand five hundred miles, and from New York to Australia about four thousand miles. The saving in time for a vessel of nine knots speed from New York to Iquique, Chile, one of the ports from which the heavy nitrate shipments are made, will be over twenty-three days. The trip from Liverpool to Iquique will be decreased nearly three thousand miles. The saving of time and money which will result to those engaged in the world's commerce by the use of the Panama Canal cannot be calculated.

The Panama Canal is the achievement of the United States alone. No other nation has aided in its creation. In August, 1912, the Act of Congress making provision for the permanent government of the Canal Zone became a law. The law exempts coastwise trade from tolls. This comparatively unimportant provision and the provisions of the law which deny the right to use the Canal to vessels owned by railway companies and those violating the provisions of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law have been made the basis of a formal Protest by Great Britain on the ground that they are in conflict with the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty. That Protest raises questions of the utmost importance. The manner in which those questions shall be determined will profoundly affect the commercial development and national integrity of the United States.

THE HISTORY OF THE CANAL

A brief history of the Panama Canal is essential to an understanding of the present controversy. In 1846 a treaty was entered into between the United States and Colombia, then called New Granada. The treaty gave to the United States a right of transit over the Isthmus of Panama "from the one to the other sea." The Panama Railroad, which was completed in 1855, was a result of this treaty. In 1849 the United States entered into a treaty with Nicaragua which provided for the construction of a ship canal from Greytown (San Juan) on the Atlantic coast to the Pacific coast by way of the Lake of Nicaragua. Great Britain, claiming a Protectorate over the Mosquito Indians, in whose territory the Atlantic end would be placed, insisted that it alone should dictate the terms upon which the Nicaragua route should be opened. The British claim was in defiance of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Monroe Doctrine and without moral or legal basis.

Mr. Lawrence, United States Minister at London, presented the protest of his Government. It was ignored. Sir Henry Bulwer, the British Minister at Washington, realizing that Mr. Clayton, the Secretary of State in President Zachary Taylor's Cabinet, had been alarmed by other acts of British aggression involving the seizure of Tigre Island, ignored Mr. Lawrence, and concluded the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty directly with Mr. Clayton. This treaty was ratified July 5, 1850. The treaty provided that neither Great Britain nor the United States should ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over the Canal or erect fortifications upon it, nor occupy or exercise any dominion over any part of Central America; and that, in the event of war, the vessels of Great Britain or the United States must be permitted to pass unmolested, and that both parties should guard the safety and preserve the neutrality of the Canal. The treaty also provided that the parties to it had been actuated, not only by the desire to accomplish a particular object, "but also to establish a general principle," and that "they hereby agree to extend their protection, by treaty stipulation, to any other practicable communication, whether by canal or railway, across the Isthmus . . . and especially to interoceanic communications . . . which are now proposed to be established by way of Tehuantepec or Panama."

By this treaty Great Britain tied the hands of the United States and reserved to herself the absolute power of obstruction. It is unnecessary to comment upon the opposition which the American people manifested to this treaty, or to trace the many diplomatic controversies which arose in regard to it, or to note the forcible objections which Seward, Evarts, and Blaine felt compelled to make to it. The significant fact to be here noted is that, until the treaty was superseded in 1901, it presented a complete bar to the efforts of the United States to secure the building of the Canal.

In 1878 the Wyse Concession was made by Colombia, and subsequently a French construction company was organized under the presidency of Ferdinand de Lesseps to build the Panama Canal. The prospect of the Canal under French control was cause for alarm in the United States. In a special message to Congress, March 8, 1880, President Hayes asserted that the policy of the United States required a canal under American control. Mr. Blaine, in language so forcible as not to permit of misunderstanding, pointed out that the passage of the armed vessels of a hostile nation through the Panama Canal would be no more admissible than the passage of armed forces of a hostile nation over the railway lines joining the Atlantic and the Pacific shores of the United States. The French Government gave the United States its assurance that it did not aim at political control, and expressed "its firm purpose to allow the character of the enterprise inaugurated by M. de Lesseps to remain an essentially private one." (See the "Treaty Regulations of the United States and Colombia," by John H. Latané, Ph.D., Annals of the American Academy of Political Science, 1903.) The failure of the French company in 1888 permanently defeated the efforts of M. de Lesseps, and the hope that the Canal would be built was again deferred.

On November 18, 1901, the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty was concluded. It recites the desire of the United States and Great Britain to facilitate the construction of a ship canal "by whatever route may be considered expedient," and to remove the objections arising from the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty without impairing the "general principle of neutralization established in Article Eight of that Convention."

The First Article of the treaty provided that it should supersede the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty. The Second Article provides "that the Canal may be constructed under the auspices of the Government of the United States," either at its own cost, or by gift or loan of money to individuals or corporations, or through subscription to or purchase of stock and shares. This article also provides that the United States "shall have and enjoy all the rights incident to such construction, as well as the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the Canal."

The Third Article of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty deals with the neutralization of the Canal, and in its first subdivision provides that "the Canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise. Such conditions and charges shall be just and equitable."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Article Fourth of the Treaty provides "that no change of territorial sovereignty or of the international relations of the country or countries traversed by the before-mentioned Canal shall affect the general principle of neutralization or the obligation of the high contracting parties to the present treaty." This clause was evidently inserted to guard against the treaty's being impaired by changes in the South American Republics, but it did not contemplate the possibility of the United States acquiring the territory through which the Canal is to be pierced. A study of the treaty in connection with the Convention of Constantinople and with a full understanding of the circumstances under which the treaty was made shows clearly that the acquisition of the Canal territory by the United States was not foreseen by either of the contracting parties. It should be noted that nothing contained in the treaty imposes any prohibition upon either of the contracting parties from purchasing territory to be traversed by the proposed Canal.

On January 20, 1902, President Roosevelt sent to Congress a message recommending the construction of the Canal at Panama. His message proposed the purchase of the French rights for $40,000,000. Congress acted upon this suggestion and appropriated $170,000,000, and directed the President, if the consent of Colombia could not be obtained, to have the Canal constructed by the Nicaragua route at a cost not to exceed $180,000,000. The Hay-Herran Treaty between the United States and Colombia was then negotiated, by which Colombia was to grant the desired privilege in return for $10,000,000 and an annual rental of $250,000. The terms of this proposed treaty had been agreed upon between the accredited representatives of the United States and Colombia, and the Senate of the United States on March 17, 1903, ratified the proposed treaty. The Colombian Government, however, sought to repudiate the promise of its representative, and indicated that it would ratify the treaty if it was paid $25,000,000. When the United States refused to yield to this demand, Colombia concluded that it could not "constitutionally" comply with its promise to ratify the treaty. That the alleged constitutional objection was a mere pretense is evident from the fact that it could have been overcome by a payment of $15,000,000 more than the United States had agreed to pay and Colombia to accept. The action of Colombia in causing the proposed treaty to fail of ratification incensed and embittered the people of the State of Panama, whose interests would have been greatly promoted by the construction of the Canal. The attitude of Colombia served to intensify the spirit of revolt among the people of Panama, who for many years had been treated unjustly by the Colombian Government. This last act of Colombia showed such a total disregard of the interests of the people of Panama, and was instigated by motives so sordid and odious, that the State of Panama seceded from Colombia and established a provisional government. Within a short time the United States, Great Britain, and France recognized the independence of the new Republic of Panama.

On November 18, 1903, M. Bunau-Varilla, the accredited representative of Panama, and Secretary Hay, signed the Treaty of Panama, which was duly ratified. This treaty grants the United States in perpetuity a zone of land and land under water for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Canal, of the width of ten miles, beginning in the Caribbean Sea and extending to and across the Isthmus of Panama into the Pacific Ocean, with the exception of the cities of Panama and Colon. Certain other incidental territory and islands are also granted. The treaty grants the United States "all the rights, power, and authority" within the zone mentioned "which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory within which the said lands and waters are located, to the entire exclusion of the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, and authority." Article Five of this treaty grants to the United States in perpetuity a monopoly for the construction, maintenance, and operation of any system of communication, by means of canal or railway, across its territory between the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean. In return for this grant the United States guarantees to maintain the independence of the Republic of Panama, and to pay Panama $10,000,000, and from nine years after the date of the treaty to make an annual payment of $250,000 during the life of the treaty. The Eighteenth Article of this treaty provides that "the Canal, when constructed, and the entrances thereto, shall be neutral in perpetuity, and shall be opened upon the terms provided for by Section 1 of Article Three of, and in conformity with all

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the stipulations of the treaty entered into by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain on November 18, 1901." In considering this provision of the Panama Treaty, it is to be borne in mind that it is binding only upon the parties to it. That treaty prescribes and defines the correlative rights and duties of the United States and of the Republic of Panama. It does not enlarge the rights of Great Britain in reference to the Canal. Great Britain was not a party to the Hay-Varilla Treaty, and any obligation that was imposed upon the United States under it is due solely to the Republic of Panama, and is subject to any change that may be effected by mutual consent of the contracting parties.

This historical outline makes clear the steps which the United States has taken and the difficulties which it has finally overcome. The territory through which the Canal is being constructed is subject solely to the sovereignty of the United States. Now that the United States has done everything requisite and necessary to make the Canal available for use, and has pledged itself to preserve to the commerce of the world the right to use it upon fair and reasonable terms, Great Britain comes forward to enter its Protest against the exemption of American coastwise trade, with which, under existing laws, foreign nations cannot compete.

THE BRITISH PROTEST

The Panama Canal Act, providing for the government of the Canal Zone and exempting coastwise trade from tolls, was enacted after a careful and scientific inquiry by Congress into the conditions affecting the Panama Canal. On December 9, 1912, Ambassador Bryce filed with the Secretary of State of the United States a Protest against certain provisions of the Panama Canal Act. The Protest was signed for the British Government by Sir Edward Grey. The Protest is based on the contention that the provisions of the Panama Canal Act contravene the provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty. The particulars in which this Act is claimed to be in conflict with the treaty are: (I) The provisions of Section 5 of the Act, which confer upon the President, within certain defined limits, the right to fix the tolls, but provide that no tolls are to be levied upon ships engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States. There is also an exemption made pursuant to Article Nineteen of the Panama Treaty, according to which the Republic of Panama has the right to transport over the Canal its vessels and its troops and munitions of war without paying charges of any kind. If the United States should yield to this part of the British Protest, it would be necessary for it to act in violation of its treaty with the Republic of Panama. It is claimed that these provisions, first, are in conflict with the rule established in Article Eight of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of equal treatment for British and United States ships; and, second, would enable tolls to be fixed which would not be just and equitable, and would, therefore, not comply with Rule 1 of Article Three of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty. (II) The provisions of Section 11 of the Act, which prohibit a railway company subject to the Inter-State Commerce Act of 1887 from having any interest in vessels which operate through the Canal, and that part of the same section which provides that a vessel permitted to engage in coastwise or foreign trade of the United States shall not be permitted to use the Canal if its owner is guilty of violating the Sherman Anti-Trust Act.

Both of these claims rest upon the assumption that the events which have occurred since the ratification of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty can have no effect upon the validity of that treaty. In reference to the claim based on Section 11 of the Act, the Protest makes no argument, but calls attention to the fact that, if the provisions of that section are to be deemed applicable to British ships, the British Government reserves the right to amplify its Protest after further study of the question involved. The reasons which impelled Congress to enact Section 11 of the Act are obvious. By these provisions it was sought to prevent monopoly of transportation in the Canal, and thus to keep the Canal open to the free competition of the commerce of the world. Experience has taught the lesson that, when the same company controls the means of transportation by land and sea, competition is rendered impossible.

President Taft, in an effort to place upon the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty a construction which would make it adaptable to the changed conditions which have resulted since the acquisition of the Canal Zone by the United States, treated the words "all nations" used in Subdivision 1 of Article Three of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty as excluding the United States. The British Protest refuses to accept this construction, and, referring to the argu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment of President Taft, announces plainly that "His Majesty's Government believe this statement of the case to be wholly at variance with the real question. They consider that by the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty the United States has surrendered the right to construct the Canal, and that by the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty it recovered that right, upon the footing that the Canal should be open to British and United States vessels upon equal terms." Great Britain, therefore, having explicitly refused to be bound by any construction of the treaty which recognizes and makes allowance for the changed conditions which have resulted since the adoption of the treaty, squarely presents to the United States the alternative of adopting an American Canal Policy or an Anglo-American Canal Policy. Under the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty Great Britain claimed to be a partner in the Canal enterprise with the United States. Under the British Protest, transmitted by Sir Edward Grey, Great Britain still claims all the benefits of a partnership, although all the burdens of the enterprise are, under the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, to be borne solely by the United States. The importance of the Protest consists, not in the fact that it relates to tolls, but in the fact that it carries with it the assertion that the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty exists with the same force and effect to-day that it possessed before the United States became the sovereign over the territory through which the Canal is being constructed. If this claim be admitted, and the words "all nations" as used in Subdivision 1 of Article Three of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty are to be regarded as including the United States, then the following consequences result:

The United States must impose the same rate of tolls upon its merchant ships, warships, or Government vessels that it does upon those of foreign nations; it can never blockade the Canal or exercise any right of war in it, even if it is itself a belligerent, and the representatives of the United States at Panama must open the locks and escort a hostile fleet through the Canal; if the United States becomes a belligerent it shall not revictual or take stores in the Canal, except when strictly necessary; it shall not embark or disembark troops or munitions of war in the Canal territory, and its own war vessels shall not remain in the waters adjacent to the Canal within the three-mile limit for longer than twenty-four hours at any one time; and it cannot use the plant and surroundings of the Canal for any hostile purpose.

In short, if the United States should become a belligerent it could not use its own Canal for naval and military purposes, and the Canal would be of no more strategic value to it than it would be to its enemy.[1]

Indeed, in time of war, if the provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty are to govern, our seacoast would be more liable to attack than it was before the Canal was built. Before the Canal was built the isolation of our seaboard furnished comparative protection from foreign attack. The existence of the Canal will make our coast thousands of miles nearer to the shores of a foreign enemy. If the Canal shall be available to us for naval and military purposes, this danger will be obviated. If it is not to be available for these purposes, then we have increased the danger of our position rather than increased our safety. One has only to read the provisions of the six subdivisions of Article Three of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty to see at a glance that if one of these subdivisions is binding upon us all are binding. The same obligation which would require us to levy equal tolls, as provided by Subdivision 1, would compel us to refrain from blockading the Canal or from utilizing the Canal for any military or naval purpose in the manner prohibited by the other subdivisions of Article Three. The British Protest does not specifically claim that all of these provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty are applicable at present, but it attacks a comparatively unimportant regulation of Congress upon a ground which asserts the binding effect of that treaty. The British Protest makes no renunciation of rights under the treaty. It does, however, recognize that, as a result of events subsequent to the treaty, the United States has "become the practical sovereign of the Canal," and that all the provisions of the treaty are not to be deemed of the same force that they possessed when the treaty was concluded. The significance of this remarkable part of the British Protest will be commented upon below. For the present it is necessary only to note that even the British Government recognizes that a

[1] Judge Seabury is, of course, stating these conclusions as a *reductio ad absurdum*. The reply to this argument, made by those who advocate the maintenance of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, is that, in time of war, all treaties will be abrogated; but the whole trend of Judge Seabury's argument is that the treaty *was* abrogated when the United States acquired the Canal territory.—THE EDITORS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

change in the status existing at the time the treaty was made has taken place, and that it is impossible to claim that the legal effect of the treaty has not been changed.

THE STATE OF THINGS WHICH WAS THE BASIS OF THE HAY-PAUNCEFOTE TREATY HAS CHANGED, AND THAT TREATY IS NOW VOIDABLE AT THE OPTION OF THE UNITED STATES

It is a rule of international law, recognized among nations and publicists, that all treaties are concluded upon the tacit condition *rebus sic stantibus*. If vital changes affecting the subject matter of a treaty take place, so that it cannot fairly be said that the parties contracted in reference to the changed conditions, the treaty is, by implication, abrogated. In other words, if the parties to a treaty contract on the basis that a certain condition or fact exists, and subsequently the condition or fact in reference to which the treaty is made is changed, the treaty is extinguished, and one of the parties to it cannot, in good faith, hold the other bound to perform all or any of its terms. The fundamental fact in reference to which the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty was made was that the Canal was to be constructed in territory alien to the United States. The Hay-Pauncefote Treaty did not even definitely decide upon the Panama route, but provided for the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans "by whatever route may be considered expedient." The treaty contemplated merely that the Canal should be constructed "under the auspices" of the United States, not in the territory of the United States. That the United States did not contemplate the actual acquisition of the territory in which the Canal was to be constructed is conclusively evidenced by the fact that the Senate ratified the treaty with Colombia, which merely provided for constructing the Canal "under the auspices" of the United States, and did not contemplate the cession of territory to the United States. The failure of Colombia to fulfill the promise of its accredited representative, the bitterness and spirit of revolt which that refusal engendered among the people of the State of Panama, led to the revolution which resulted in the secession of Panama from Colombia. The United States having been betrayed by Colombia, President Roosevelt, with characteristic genius, took the action which resulted in the United States securing the grant from Panama. Under that grant the Canal Zone became part of the territory of the United States and subject to its sovereignty, and the United States from that time on possessed the same exclusive rights over it that it possessed in reference to any other territory which it acquired by cession or conquest.

The Hay-Pauncefote Treaty was made on the understanding that the Canal was to be constructed upon alien territory. For this reason the position of the United States relative to the Canal was regarded as analogous to the position of Great Britain toward the Suez Canal. Assuming that the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty provides for equal rights in the Canal to Great Britain and the United States, although all the burdens of building and caring for it and policing it were to devolve upon the United States, the situation becomes radically different after the territory becomes subject to the sovereignty of the United States. Suppose, merely for the sake of argument, instead of acquiring the Canal Zone in Panama, the United States abandoned that project and constructed the Canal from New Orleans to San Francisco, would it be contended that the Canal was subject to the provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty? In legal effect and in principle the supposed case and the real case are identical. The treaty was made on the assumption that the Canal was to be built in alien territory. The condition in reference to which the treaty was made never arose; and instead of the Canal's being built in alien territory, it was built in territory of the United States.

The juridical status of the Panama Canal is that of an artificially constructed waterway, constructed wholly by the United States for commercial and strategic purposes, entirely through territory of the United States, the exclusive right of control over which is vested in the United States. The legal position of the United States and Great Britain in reference to the Canal stands, when the case is reduced to its simplest terms, thus: A and B contract that A shall endeavor to obtain an easement over the land of C, and if A succeeds, the easement shall be used equally by A and B, but without any prohibition in the contract against either A or B acquiring the fee to C's land. Subsequently, C grants in fee the property to A and his heirs. The judgment of the private law of civilized states in such a case holds that the contract between A and B is no longer of any legal force or effect.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The principle asserted above—that all treaties are concluded upon the tacit condition *rebus sic stantibus*, and that, where the state of things which was the basis of the treaty and one of its tacit conditions no longer exists, the treaty becomes voidable, and either party may notify the other that it regards the treaty as abrogated—is sustained by authority. The principle was clearly recognized by Vattel ("Law of Nations," Book 2, C. 13, S. 200), and by Grotius ("The Rights of War and Peace," Chap. XVI, S. XXV, et seq.), and, so far as I have been able to discover, is denied by none. Mr. Hall, in his work on International Law, points out that neither party to an international compact "can make its binding effect dependent at his will upon conditions other than those contemplated at the moment when the contract was entered into; and, on the other hand, a contract ceases to be binding so soon as anything which formed an implied condition of its obligatory force at the time of its conclusion is essentially altered" (S. 116). Mr. Hannis Taylor says: "So unstable are the conditions of international existence, and so difficult is it to enforce a contract between states after the state of facts upon which it was founded has substantially changed, that all such agreements are necessarily made subject to the general understanding that they shall cease to be obligatory so soon as the conditions upon which they were executed are essentially altered." ("Treatise on International Public Law," Sec. 394.) Writing upon the same subject, Mr. Oppenheim says: "It is an almost universally recognized fact that vital changes of circumstances may be of such a kind as to justify a party in notifying an unnotifiable treaty. The vast majority of publicists, as well as all the Governments of the members of the Family of Nations, agree that all treaties are concluded under the tacit condition *rebus sic stantibus*" (Vol. 1, p. 550, Sec. 539).

That the circumstances have changed to such an extent that *some* of the provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty are extinguished is impliedly conceded by Sir Edward Grey in the British Protest. He says: "Now that the United States has become the practical sovereign of the Canal, His Majesty's Government do not question its title to exercise belligerent rights for its protection." His statement suggests that, if it had been contemplated that the United States was to acquire the territory through which the Canal should be constructed, clauses would have been inserted in the treaty which would have established the status of the United States as similar to that accorded Turkey and Egypt in reference to the Suez Canal. It is, of course, not improbable, if the possibility of the acquisition by the United States had been foreseen, that Great Britain would have made even this suggestion; but it ought not to be assumed that the United States would have consented to occupy toward its own Canal an attitude similar to that which European Powers, under the direction of Great Britain, have accorded Turkey and Egypt toward the Suez Canal.

The statement made in the British Protest indicates that the next contention of Great Britain will be that the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty has been constructively modified so as to make Articles Ten and Thirteen of the Suez Canal Convention applicable to the United States. However this may be, it is needless to speculate. The important circumstance now to be noted is that although Great Britain does not ask for a formal modification of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, nor renounce any legal rights she may have under the treaty, the concession is distinctly made that the changed conditions have modified *some* of the provisions of the treaty. Although this concession does not define which of the stipulations of the treaty the British Government considers to have been extinguished, it apparently concedes certain belligerent rights to the United States, which, if the provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty were in force, the United States would not possess. There is no justification for the claim that the abrogation of the provisions of the treaty has been *pro tanto*. If the state of things which was the vital condition of the treaty no longer exists, the whole treaty justly may be abrogated. One thing is plain as to the legal effect of the treaty: either all of its stipulations are binding upon the United States, or none of them is binding. From a juridical standpoint, the change which has taken place is the most fundamental that could occur. The very subject matter of the treaty, which the treaty contemplated should continue to be territory alien to the United States, has become absolutely subject to the sovereignty of the United States. To hold, under these circumstances, that *all* the terms of the treaty are binding upon the United States would be preposterous, and does not seem to be claimed in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British Protest. The same circumstances which relieve the United States of *some* of the terms of the treaty relieve it of *all* of them. It can hardly be asserted, if changes so vital occur that some of the terms of a treaty are extinguished, one of the parties to the treaty can determine which of the other provisions of the treaty shall continue to be binding upon the other party to the compact. As some of the terms of this treaty are concededly no longer binding, none of them is binding if the United States shall so elect. The Hay-Pauncefote Treaty has now become voidable, and the United States is entirely justified, under accepted principles of international law, in notifying Great Britain that it no longer considers that treaty to be in force. If the United States is to adopt an American Canal Policy, this it must do. If it does not do this, it must admit the claim of Great Britain to be an equal partner with the United States in the Canal enterprise. The latter course involves the establishment of an Anglo-American Canal Policy, in direct defiance of the Monroe Doctrine; and it will create an entangling alliance which in the future must inevitably be the source of dissension and strife.

CONCLUSION

The question has arisen whether the controversy as to the Panama Canal should be submitted to the Tribunal of The Hague for arbitration. Sir Edward Grey in the British Protest suggests that if the provisions of the Panama Canal Act to which objection is made are not repealed the question at issue should be submitted to arbitration. This suggestion involves the consideration of two questions: first, does the arbitration treaty require the submission of the question at issue to arbitration? and, second, if it does not so require, should the United States consent to the submission of this question to arbitration?

If existing treaties require the submission of the question to arbitration, the matter is settled, and nothing remains to the United States but to adopt this course. The Convention of 1899 for the Arbitration of International Disputes was signed by the representatives of the United States subject to a reservation which is set forth at length after their signatures. That reservation is as follows: "Nothing contained in this Convention shall be so construed as to require the United States of America to depart from its traditional policy of not entering upon, interfering with, or entangling itself in the political questions of policy or internal administration of any foreign state; nor shall anything contained in the said Convention be construed to imply a relinquishment by the United States of America of its traditional attitude towards purely American questions."

Inasmuch as the Panama Canal is constructed in territory exclusively subject to the sovereignty of the United States, any question as to its control is a purely American question, as to which the United States, in signing the treaty referred to, refused to relinquish its traditional attitude. The traditional attitude of the United States is inconsistent with the submission to arbitration of any question as to a part of the territory over which its exclusive sovereignty extends. That the Monroe Doctrine represents the traditional attitude of the United States will not be questioned, nor will it be seriously urged that the United States should submit to arbitration the question as to whether it should adhere to or renounce the Monroe Doctrine as a part of its National policy. That doctrine involves one of the very questions which the representatives of the United States reserved the right to withhold from arbitration. It has never been a doctrine which commended itself to European statesmen, but it defines a policy essential to the development and National existence of the United States. The controversy as to the control of the Panama Canal is of precisely the same character, and the reservation made by the representatives of the United States in signing the arbitration treaty relieves the United States from submitting this question to arbitration. As to whether it would be good policy to submit this particular question to arbitration may be safely left to the good judgment of the American Congress. Congress, realizing the unfortunate experiences which the United States has had in dealing with the Panama Canal, may well hesitate to jeopardize the present position which the United States has attained by submitting so purely an American question to the arbitrament of a foreign tribunal.

The Treaty of April 4, 1908, between the United States and Great Britain provides that "differences which may arise of a legal nature or relating to the interpretation of treaties existing between the two contracting parties, and which it may not have been pos-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sible to settle by diplomacy, shall be referred to the Permanent Court of Arbitration established at The Hague by the Convention of the 29th of July, 1899, provided, nevertheless, that they do not affect the vital interests, the independence, or the honor of the two contracting states, and do not concern the interests of third parties."

This treaty imposes upon the United States no obligation to arbitrate the present controversy, because that controversy does not relate "to the interpretation of treaties existing between the two contracting parties."

It has already been pointed out that the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty is now voidable and may be rendered void by the United States giving notice to Great Britain of the election so to declare the treaty. Moreover, it is plain that the present controversy falls squarely within the exception contained in the clause of the treaty quoted above. The question at issue does affect the vital interests, the independence, and the honor of the United States. It is a question which does concern the Republic of Panama, and, therefore, is not referable as a matter of right under this treaty. The exemption of vessels of the Republic of Panama from tolls, under the provisions of the Panama Canal Act, was provided for in compliance with Article Nineteen of the Panama Treaty. The British Protest is against this provision of the Act. If this question is submitted to arbitration and should be determined adversely to us, the United States would be obliged either to comply with the award of the Arbitration Tribunal and violate its treaty with Panama, or to violate the arbitration award and comply with its treaty with Panama. The question at issue does, therefore, "concern the interests of third parties," and is one in reference to which the treaty provides that it need not be submitted to arbitration.

The adoption of an American Canal Policy is in accord with the best traditions of the United States. It is the only policy which can be pursued consistent with the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine. The utterances of American statesmen which are sometimes quoted as favoring a contrary policy were utterances made on the assumption that the Canal was to be built on territory alien to the United States. The position assumed by President Cleveland was based on the desire to avoid "entangling alliances" with the country through which it was supposed the Canal would be constructed. The traditional attitude of the American people in reference to the Canal was expressed by General Grant when he said, "I commend an American Canal, on American soil, to the American people." After a century crowded with difficulties and vicissitudes, the Panama Canal, as the result of American genius, is about to be opened to the world. It is constructed wholly on territory subject to the sovereignty of the United States, and that country is shortly to determine whether it will pursue in regard to it an American Policy, or whether, disregarding the lessons of experience and in violation of American traditions, it will admit Great Britain as an equal partner in the enterprise. If an Anglo-American Policy is desired, the United States will comply with the demands contained in the British Protest. If an American Canal Policy is to be adopted, the Government at Washington will deal in no uncertain way with the British Protest. The present is no time for vacillation or hesitancy. The requirements of the situation demand that the Government at Washington shall plainly inform the British Government that the conditions under which the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty was concluded have vitally changed, and that that treaty is now, under the principles of international law, voidable, and give notice that the United States regards it as without force or effect.

Such action is required by every consideration of justice, and should be taken without equivocation. Any other course will involve gross injustice to the United States, and will serve only to postpone the time when the United States, in self-defense, will be compelled to take the position suggested. As the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty is now voidable rather than void, the Government of the United States should see to it that no action or failure to act on its part shall be construed into a renunciation of the rights which at present, under well-settled principles, it possesses.

Just and courageous action on the part of the United States will remove all difficulties which are presented by the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty and leave the pathway free for the adoption of an American Canal Policy. An American Canal, constructed by American enterprise on American soil, subject to the absolute and exclusive control of the United States, will prove a safeguard in times of war, and in times of peace will confer the greatest benefits, not only upon the United States, but upon all mankind.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT HE LOST

BY EDWARD A. STEINER

FOR a quarter of a century a friend of mine has lived in New York—that is, he does business there. He really lives far enough away to escape the grind and grime and poverty of the big city. Somewhere on the fashionable edge of a suburb, among the like-minded, or the like-pursed, he does his sleeping and most of his eating. He also goes to church there, and occasionally he hears Home Missionary addresses about the dreadful problems of the dreadful city. On a recent visit he asked me to take him about and show him New York; for he felt himself a stranger to it, knowing only the twenty blocks which lie between his business and the ferry.

"What shall I show you?" I asked.

"Take me," he said, "to the place where it is dirtiest and most crowded; where I can experience some of the horrors we read about—take me to the East Side."

We went together on a Sunday afternoon, and within ten minutes of Fifth Avenue we were in the thick of humanity.

I have waded against the breakers of the sea, and felt the sweeping waves driving me back, and shaking my frame; this was a similar experience, only the force manifested itself in flesh and blood, and not in wind and wave. Children of all ages, sizes, and kinds ran about, were carried by those who ran, or perambulated in baby-carriages. These horseless carriages are found on the East Side in the ratio of ten thousand to one automobile, and are less dangerous to the human race from many view-points, especially the biological one. The immigrant on the East Side holds the future more securely than those of us who live where the ratio between the baby-carriage and the automobile is reversed.

There were no horrors visible. Of course there were some puny children and sickly men and women; but perhaps health and vigor were as evenly distributed as in the less crowded sections of the city where men and women are worn by leisure and not by labor. It was a happy multitude. It knew the value of the Sabbath respite, and drew joy out of every bit of sunshine; while every blessed plot of grass was as sacred as the prayer-rug of the Moslem.

Of course we went into some of the cafés where the men greeted me with kisses, where innumerable cigarettes were smoked, and the small talk of the home town and the home land was circulated. We saw card-playing, some mild gambling and some which was not mild; but my guest was not greatly shocked, for his wife belonged to a bridge club, and although he was a Presbyterian deacon he knew more about cards than that the ace of spades is black.

When I saw that he had had his fill of the coffee-house life, I said:

"Are you game?" He answered:

"I am."

"Well, then, let us visit some of the homes of these people."

"Is there much danger?" he queried.

"Yes," I said, "there is—you might lose your prejudices."

So we climbed four stories of a tenement, bumping our heads against dark corners, and my friend nearly committed homicide by stepping upon a real live child. I knocked at one of the doors, which was cautiously opened, and an eye peered through the crack; then a joyous shout of recognition was heard, and we were bidden to enter.

It was the Christian Sunday, but in this Jewish home there was Sabbath cleanliness, and there were the odors of Sabbath food. The room was full of well-dressed girls, who showed the same proportion of gold teeth, raven locks obviously not their own, and beautiful complexions spoiled by powder, that we would have found on Fifth Avenue, or in my friend's fashionable suburb. Shirt-sleeved men smoked cigarettes and women and children chattered.

I introduced our host: "This is Mr. Abramovitz and his wife, and these are Leah and Rachel, and Moses and Maud, and Alfred and Donald, and Irma and Anna, and here is the baby—"

"No, not *the* baby," the mother interrupted; "since last year, blessed be God, there is another one. Here is *the* baby." And here it was.

It should be said that the children who had Old Testament names were born in Russia, the others, beginning with Maud, on the East Side. That did not end the introductions.

"This is Mr. Brosalik, who is engaged to Leah; and this is Mr. Jacobson, who is engaged to Rachel." And both the girls show

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their diamond rings to prove that it is a "sure go."

"This is my feller," and Maud pushes forward an ungainly youth. Irma and Anna are also engaged—in chewing gum; and the baby, and the other baby, are held by admiring female relatives who also have other children with them.

I watched my friend the Presbyterian deacon. He lives, that is, he resides, in a house with "many mansions." He has two children; but one of them is away in school, and the other is in Europe. I looked for signs of displeasure in his face, but there were none. Irma was on one knee, Anna on the other, and soon he held the ex-baby in one arm. *The* baby stretched out her hand to the big man with the smooth face and the gold spectacles, which she grabbed as soon as she came within the proper distance. My friend smiled. He rarely smiles, but it was a reawakening of an old smile which used to play upon his face when he held his own babies—which, however, was very seldom. The nurse said it was not good for babies to be trotted on the knee, and although he was master of many men, he was not master of his own babies.

Now he was holding the tenement babies, and trotting them, and singing to them, and he seemed very happy in the crowded room.

The subjects of conversation were not so soon exhausted as my friend expected. They talked about the plays, and about the Little Theater, which he had not seen; they discussed Galsworthy, Ibsen, and Mrs. Fiske; and of course they discussed politics. The minutes and hours swept by and my friend was still happy.

Russian tea was served with delicious cake, and my friend the Presbyterian deacon smoked one, two, and more cigarettes, and before we knew it the sun was down, and the noise and tumult came more faintly through the windows. The babies grew cross and sleepy, and we made ready to go.

"Come with us to the children's hour," Irma and Anna cried together.

"I take baby too," the older one said.

We went down the four flights, followed by noisy good-bys—down, one, two, or more blocks, and were halted by some fifty or more children making their way up the stairs to the Christodora settlement. It was not as yet an Institution, but a house, with a great spirit in it, and no cumbersome machinery. These children were guests, not problems to be solved or souls to be saved. They were just guests at the Children's Hour.

The room seemed to bulge with them. They sat down in relays, and stood till their weak knees tired, then sat down again, while others stood in their places.

There were beautiful faces, some of the most beautiful I have ever seen. There were curly, dark heads and golden locks, blue eyes and black eyes. Wistful, pathetic children, old before they were young; some burdened by hereditary curses, while others were strong, beautiful, spiritual, redeemed.

"Let us sing," said the leader.

My friend the Presbyterian deacon teaches a Sunday-school class in his beautiful suburb. They have a precentor and a section of an orchestra, but no such singing as this. I could hear his breath come hard, even as mine came. These voices gripped one's heart; for they came from the heart, way down from the bottom of the heart, and rose way up "to where the angels sing."

It was not only how they sang, but what they sang. Of course they could not sing Christian Sunday-school hymns, and that from many a standpoint was a great good fortune. From the musical standpoint certainly, from the poetic standpoint equally so, and from the religious standpoint none the less. They did not sing theology and eschatology; meaningless, pious phraseology; but words of life, soulful words, which children may learn to understand and to love.

"Now, children," the spirit of the place said, "who has a Psalm for us?"

"All right, Irma, you may say the eighth Psalm."

Irma came forward, and, looking straight at my friend the deacon, recited the Psalm.

"Oh, Jehovah!" There was a faint *r* at the end of that great word. "Oh, Jehovah, our Lord."

Somehow that word Jehovah on the lips of a Jewish child sounds full and strong; it has a home sound, as if it belonged there.

"How excellent is thy name in all the earth,
Who hast set thy glory upon the heaven.
Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast
thou established strength."

Irma knows about the strength of babes and sucklings, the strength of their lungs, and she almost shrieked the sentence.

"Because of thine adversaries
That thou mightest still the enemy and the
avenger.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers,
The moon and the stars which thou hast ordained."

And she looked up to the dingy ceiling, as if her eyes rested upon the blue sky. She had repeated that Psalm at the Settlement's summer camp, where the moon and stars can be seen.

"What is man that thou art mindful of him?
And the son of man, that thou visitest him?
For thou hast made him but little lower than God,
And crownest him with glory and honor.
Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands;
Thou hast put all things under his feet,
All sheep and oxen."

Irma didn't as yet see the contrast between what the Lord had put under their feet and how much their landlord charges them for standing room.

"She does not as yet realize that all sheep and oxen are in the hands of the meat trust. Some day she will, and then what will happen, my friend?" I am whispering that into my friend's ear, and the good spirit of the house looks at me reproachfully.

Yet what *will* happen when the babes and sucklings know that they have been robbed of strength and the land and the sheep and the oxen and the fish of the sea!

With an indescribable pathos Irma closes this hymn of the great Temple singer,

"O Jehovah, our Lord,
How excellent is thy name in all the earth."

A deep silence follows the recitation of this Psalm. It is the silence of the Holy Temple.

"Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings." Listen a minute, my friend the deacon, to these children of the tenements, blessed by this children's hour.

"Did you have a turkey in your house on Thanksgiving? How many had one?" asked the Good Spirit? No hands were raised.

"How many of you had none?"

The dancing fingers were thick in the air.

"What did you have, Julia? Julia will tell us what she had for Thanksgiving."

"We had soup mit noodles in it!"

"That's good."

"And noodles mit cheese on it, and bananas."

"Did you have no meat?"

"No, Miss Good Spirit; but we put the baby on the middle of the table and we said, 'Thanks to Jehovah, our Lord, for the baby!'"

"How many children are there in your home, Emily?" was asked of a diminutive girl who came to the Children's Hour carrying one baby in her arms, while one toddler clung to her hand.

"We got eight."

"Well, well! eight children! Isn't that too many?"

"Mamma and I have talked it over," the little worldly-wise replied. "She says: 'Now look. There is Goldy, she works at the store, and she gets six dollars a week; and Benjamin is doing fine in the night school, and Louis has a paper route, and goes to school; and Minnie is such a help to father; and you take such nice care of the babies! and then the babies they are so sweet.' No, no, mother says we haven't got one too many."

"What are you going to do when you are big, Caroline?"

Caroline said, and she looked straight at the Good Spirit, "I am going to be like the Good Spirit of the Children's Hour."

They sang again, and they recited more Psalms, and a trusted visitor, who would surely not talk more than a minute, was asked to say a straightforward, honest word. They marched out with the closing song, back again through the crowded blocks, and up the dark stairs to the sheltering home.

"What do you think of it?"

"Think of it?" my friend the deacon replied. "Let me come down first, young man. I am in heaven. Think of it?

"Why, I have been in Cologne Cathedral, and at Milan. I have seen High Mass in both. I have been in great revivals, and heard Moody and Sankey. But it all seems flat compared with this. 'Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings,'" he repeated over and over and over again.

"Is there anything else you want to see?"

"Yes, I want to see an Anarchist meeting."

"Are you game?"

"Yes," he said, "I am game."

So we went through a saloon and above it, down a long, dark hallway, into a smoke-filled room, and a woman was speaking when we entered.

"Is she an Anarchist?"

"Yes," I replied, "she is the arch-Anarchist of New York."

A medium-sized woman she was, with an intellectual face, a strong, well-modulated voice, and clean-cut words, passionately uttered.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"They have possessed us, let us possess them!" she cried. "We have been their slaves long enough! They have taken our land, our tools, our bodies, the children of our bodies, and they say, 'You are free.' Yes, we are as free as a drowning man in the ocean."

The men shouted their bravos. My friend grew uneasy as the sharp words struck.

"They tell me to believe in their God, in their Christ, in the Christ they crucified and still crucify, in the Christ they worship and don't believe in. Down with their God! Down with their Christ! Up with labor! Up with the human!"

I didn't blame my friend for going out quickly. I followed him, and we walked up and down the Avenue talking it over.

"You see," I said, "these are the babes and sucklings grown up. They are demanding now what was taken from them in childhood."

We argued about child labor and the wages of the girls in his big store. One ferry after another slipped away into the dark while we still talked of the Children's Hour and of the Anarchists, until he said:

"This is the last ferry."

The ticket-chopper had dropped his bit of pasteboard into oblivion, and I stood at the outer edge of the waiting-room.

"Did you lose anything over on the East Side?"

He hastily felt in his breast pocket, and a smile came over his face.

"I think I lost my prejudice."

Then the gates swung open and the crowd surged toward the last boat.

THE HERITAGE

BY ABBIE FARWELL BROWN

No matter what my birth may be,
No matter where my lot is cast,
I am the heir in equity
Of all the precious Past.

The art, the science, and the lore
Of all the ages long since dust,
The wisdom of the world in store,
Are mine, all mine in trust.

The beauty of the living earth,
The power of the golden sun,
The Present, whatsoe'er my birth,
I share with every one.

As much as any man am I
The owner of the working day;
Mine are the minutes as they fly
To save or throw away.

And mine the Future to bequeath
Unto the generations new;
I help to shape it with my breath,
Mine as I think or do.

Present and Past my heritage,
The Future laid in my control:—
No matter what my name or age,
I am a Master-soul!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SPECTATOR

A NEAT black and gold signboard in front of the Elks' Home bore the words:

TO THE ALDRICH MEMORIAL

And the Spectator turned down Court Street accordingly. To be an Elk in Portsmouth must be desirable, for the big old brick, four square, with its two stories and a half, its bowling-alley behind, and its locust trees shading the garden, looked like a very comfortable place. Past its substantial peace, and past various old frame houses with fanlights and arched spidery trellises of white painted wood over their broad doors, the street led on, winding a bit, as all streets wind in the old town by the sea, to where a white house with green blinds, behind a white fence, bore a bronze tablet on its corner:

THE NUTTER HOUSE
IN THIS HOUSE
THOMAS BAILEY ALDRICH
PASSED THE BOYHOOD THAT HE HAS MADE IMMORTAL IN PROSE AND VERSE

Captain Nutter, Miss Abigail, Kitty, Sailor Ben, Pepper Whitcomb, Gypsy—were all these beloved friends of the Spectator's youth really behind that little side door? It is a perilous thing to visit the local habitations of one's favorite characters in fiction, and the Spectator has had some disappointments in this line that he will carry to his grave. But hope springs eternal; and the old white house was quietly promising. Also, there was a glimpse of the garden behind that would have reassured anybody, so the Spectator pushed forward and turned the door-knob.

Inside, a tiny office had been contrived, full of postal cards and books for sale, with a most courteous attendant, who passed visitors along with the monition, "You will find the autographs and mementoes in the fireproof building to the right. It is better to go there first." This building, it seems, has been placed in the garden to hold those things which belonged to the later life of Thomas Bailey Aldrich, but hardly to the Bad Boy. They were wonderfully interesting, though, and a pretty, gentle-voiced girl explained them to all comers. In glass cases and on shelves were many historic things collected by Aldrich—Napoleon's drinking-cup, a vase of Franklin's, a fine Buddhist idol, Washington's glasses and pitcher, a first edition of "Paradise Lost," some beautiful Indian silver, and other curios. The pieces of furniture were beautiful, too, and often historic. Autographs were everywhere—many of Aldrich's verses in their first draft or final form, Vedder's original illustrations to "Identity," and letters from Bryant, Emerson, Curtis, Matthew Arnold, Holmes, Weir Mitchell, Stedman, and so on. One characteristic note accompanied a photograph of Mark Twain:

Ho, T. B.

Why, it has been all of fifteen years since I sent you a portrait—then I sent you fifty-six of different vintages. I am ashamed of this long neglect. Here's the latest—(don't get scared, I haven't any more).

As ever, MARK.

June 30, '93.

Another, from Edward Everett Hale, traced with great gusto the derivation of Ponkapog, from Ponch, a heated hut, and Pog, a pond—a place where the Indians of old held their primitive Turkish bath. Saint-Gaudens wrote an interesting acknowledgment of Aldrich's poem on the Shaw Memorial, and more interesting still was this:

Am laid up disabled and paralyzed, but getting along and comfortable enough. Thanks for money and order; will send book. Best love to you and yours. WALT WHITMAN.

March 24, '89.

Here, too, was the table on which the "Story of a Bad Boy" was written, with a record in Aldrich's handwriting pasted inside the drawer, leaving the table to his two sons.

It has been largely through the help of the author's widow and surviving son that the Nutter House has been made such a perfect affair. Not that they gave the memorial—that was the doing of the people of Portsmouth, on the death of Thomas Bailey Aldrich in 1907. The old Bailey home had passed into alien hands; but a committee was formed, a fund of ten thousand dollars raised by popular subscription in sums of from one dollar to a thousand, and the old house bought back. Then began the very difficult and ticklish work of restoring the house and garden exactly to their former condition, and it is hard to say which is to-day the more marvelous—the amount of pains-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

taking thought that was necessary or the natural and unstudied effect which has been the result. From the full-rigged ship on its high shelf at the foot of the hall stairs to the family christening-robes in the closet of the Blue Chintz Room, everything is in keeping and belongs to a place, a time, and a household.

An irregularly flagged walk under an old-time vine-hung white-trellised shed outside the back door led the Spectator into the garden, to begin with—and such a garden as it was! A high white fence, with urns on the posts, and green shutters instead of palings, surrounded its irregular beds, with plank borders, and its masses of hollyhocks, phlox, larkspur, verbenas, waxberry bushes. The paths were sanded, and a hedge of lilacs divided it from the back garden and the barn—Gypsy's stable. No more old-time garden could be imagined—and yet, before the house was reclaimed as a memorial, this garden had become nothing but a place of bare, trodden earth.

"It's the only show house I ever saw that looked as if one could *live* in it," one visitor said—herself the mistress of an exquisite home. That expressed it exactly. It looked like a lived-in house, only of seventy years ago instead of to-day. In the front hall, for example, Miss Abigail might have just come in and laid down on the mahogany hall table her green silk folding parasol, with its carved ivory handle. Kitty Collins might just have tidied up her wide kitchen fireplace, with the steep and sudden stair in the wall close beside it. Grandfather Nutter might have been reading the big Bible, lying with his spectacles, bookmark, and bandanna on the round table by the stuffed chair in his bedroom—that bedroom whose white-curtained four-poster, braided rugs, and rush-bottomed chairs made every lover of the past gasp with delight by its quiet completeness. And Tom Bailey might just have left his hall bedroom, with its immortal wall-paper, where "on a gray background were small bunches of leaves, unlike any that ever grew in this world, and on every other bunch perched a yellow bird, pitted with crimson spots, as if it had just recovered from a severe attack of the smallpox. . . . There were two hundred and eighty-six of these birds in all, not counting those split in two where the paper was badly joined. I counted them once when I was laid up with a black eye, and, falling asleep, immediately dreamed that the whole flock suddenly took wing and flew out of the window. From that time I was never able to regard them merely as inanimate objects." There they were, one or two of them painted blue, as Tom Bailey had tried to improve them. And there were the playbooks on the top of the chest of drawers, along with the spotted china dog and the picture of a ship, and the triangular washstand crowded into the corner at the foot of the bed, and the bookshelves over the head of the bed, and the triangle patchwork quilt, and the looking-glass in the filigreed frame, and the high-backed chair studded with brass nails, "like a coffin." Last touch of all, and most perfect, a little blue nankeen coat, with tails—Tom Bailey's own—hung on the chair-back, as if waiting for its youthful owner to return from Bailey's Battery. A more satisfying room for its size cannot be imagined, nor one more reduced to mathematical perfection as regards boyish essentials and necessities.

The Blue Chintz Room, Miss Abigail's room, the spare room, all had the same simplicity and the same clear perfection of detail. The hand-knit bedspreads, the wonderful white quilts with their fairy stitching, the endless variety of the hooked and braided rugs, the netted and festooned canopies of the four-posters, the neat night-caps and nightgowns folded and set in place on each spotless bed—all the shining cleanliness and care of old-time housekeeping, made each room a fresh delight. Then, up a winding stair with high steps that twisted two ways in an incredibly narrow space, the Spectator reached that delectable attic from which his guide found it almost impossible ever to get him away. The attic of the Nutter House is better than even Tom Bailey's description of it. Sea-chests, hair trunks with initials on them in brass nails, picturesque paper bandboxes, gaudy carpetbags, sword-cases, Captain Bailey's sextant, hoopskirts, maps, the scenery of the Rivermouth Theater—hand-made by Tom Bailey and his aids—fire buckets, firemen's helmets, old eighteenth-century almanacs, foot-stoves, wine-coolers, a weird wooden table made at sea with balls carved inside trellised and tapering legs, impressionist bead pictures, walking-sticks—truly "what a place to sit of an afternoon with the rain pattering on the roof!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BY THE WAY

The Jewish race, as everybody knows, is increasing in wealth and numbers in New York City; but the facts have rarely been so graphically presented as in an article in "McClure's." This states that Jews are the greatest owners of real estate in New York, after the hereditary proprietors like the Astors; that they control the clothing business, the theaters, most of the department stores, many great banking houses, and some branches of the city government; that the school-teachers are largely Jewish, the police force is becoming Jewish, and that most of the prize-fighters are Jews with Irish names!

In wider business activities, the writer in "McClure's" asserts, the Jews are extremely influential in the railways of the country; they control the whisky business, eighty per cent of the members of the National Liquor Dealers' Association being Jews; they make eighty-five per cent of the cigars, leaving the great American Tobacco Company only fifteen per cent; while 90,000,000 Americans look to them for their amusements. In a hundred years, the writer concludes, the Semitic influence may be the preponderating one in this country.

"The mightiest buffalo hunter of modern times" is the title given by an English journal to E. O. Robinson, of Australia. The buffaloes were of the Asiatic variety, and were introduced into Australia by missionaries a century ago. Thousands of them were shot by Mr. Robinson, but he has still a herd of 15,000 or 20,000 on Melville Island, of which territory he has been called the "Rajah."

The most useful automobile in the United States, says "The World's Work," is perhaps the one used by Miss Mary L. Titcomb, of Washington County, Maryland. During six months it circulated 28,000 books to the remote dwellers in that county. Even the stubbornest enemies of literature give in when good books are brought to their very doors in this way.

Under the heading "What Every Débutante Should Know" a writer in "Lippincott's" says: "Because her great-grandmother smoked a pipe is no reason why she should smoke cigarettes." But wouldn't the advanced young woman who affects the cigarette be the last person in the world to admit that her great-grandmother belonged to the plebeian class of female pipe-smokers?

The manufacture of player pianos has reached such proportions that the Department of Education in New York City has established a trade school class in player piano construction. This is said to be the first time that the piano industry has been thus recognized in New York City.

Americans sometimes think that it is only in their country that vandals play their nefarious pranks on statues and ornamental grounds, and that in the artistic atmosphere of Europe art treasures are safe from molestation. But—a newspaper item tells us that "a replica of the statue of Henri Regnault, stolen last July from the park of Buzenval, the spot where he fell during the siege of Paris, has just been replaced."

Mr. E. W. Bok believes in putting the public on its honor in the matter of protecting flowers. During the last few years he has planted many thousand crocuses and daffodils outside the hedge that surrounds his place near Philadelphia, with the sign, "These flowers are under the protection of the public," and not one has been picked, though the daffodils especially were "long-stemmed and inviting."

J. P. Morgan & Co. are to have a new business home in Wall Street. It will be, it is announced, "the finest private banking house in the world." In addition to many exclusive features, it will be remarkable for its height—only four stories. A building must now be of the bungalow type to attract attention among New York's sky-scrapers.

"The Miracle" is one of the most elaborate film plays ever produced. One thousand persons are said to have been in the cast, and the production of the drama involved an expenditure of $250,000.

New York City, according to a recent census bulletin, leads the country in the value of its libraries, art galleries, and museums; Pittsburgh is second, and Boston third. Boston is first in the value of its sewer and highway department property. In parks New York leads, while Boston is second and Philadelphia third. In municipal service enterprises Chicago is first. In the value of docks and wharves New Orleans comes after New York, with Philadelphia third.

Kerosene may become a rival to gasoline as a fuel for motor cars, owing to the increasing cost of gasoline. A recent meeting of the Society of Automobile Engineers discussed the availability of kerosene for this purpose; a number of manufacturers, it is reported, already make kerosene carburetors and others are preparing to do so.

Benvenuto Cellini's famous statue of Perseus, concerning the casting of which he gives such a graphic account in his autobiography, has recently been found to have a representation of his own face, so it is asserted, on the back of the helmet. The theory is that Cosmo de' Medici would not allow Cellini to put his name on the statue, and that the sculptor circumvented his jealous patron in this way.

In learning an African language, says Mr. A. L. Kitching in "On the Backwaters of the Nile," the best-fitting key to native idiom is found in proverbs, many of which are similar to common English saws. "A burnt child dreads the fire" in Banyoro is, "He who is bitten by a snake fears a lizard;" "Between two stools you come to the ground" is, "He who hunts two rats gets nothing;" "Those who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones" is, "Hush your friend's baby after your own is asleep."

The class of Britishers, says Mr. Kitching, that believe in the sovereign virtues of the English language for use in all quarters of the globe is represented even in Uganda. "We have occasional visitors," he observes, "who think that if only they use a sufficiency of gesture and vigorous expressions no native has any business to misunderstand them; and if in addition a gun is pointed at the unfortunate's head, why, what further excuse has he for withholding information!" Mr. Kitching believes that the only way to deal successfully with the natives is to learn their language in a sympathetic spirit.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED